McGRAW-HILL SERIES IN EDUCATION
HAROLD BENJAMIN, *Consulting Editor*

The Nature of the Administrative Process

With Special Reference to Public School Administration

McGRAW-HILL SERIES IN EDUCATION

Harold Benjamin, *Consulting Editor*

Allen · The Federal Government and Education
Beaumont and Macomber · Psychological Factors in Education
Bent and Kronenberg · Principles of Secondary Education
Bogue · The Community College
Broom, Duncan, Emig, and Steuber · Effective Reading Instruction
Brownell, Gans, and Maroon · Public Relations in Education
Brubacher · A History of the Problems of Education
Brubacher · Modern Philosophies of Education
Butler and Wren · The Teaching of Secondary Mathematics
Butterworth and Dawson · The Modern Rural School
Butts · A Cultural History of Education
Carter and McGinnis · Learning to Read
Cook, Lloyd and Elaine · Intergroup Education
Cook, Lloyd and Elaine · A Sociological Approach to Education
Crow and Crow · Mental Hygiene
Croxton · Science in the Elementary School
Davis · Educational Psychology
Davis and Norris · Guidance Handbook for Teachers
De Boer, Kaulfers, and Miller · Teaching Secondary English
De Young · Introduction to American Public Education
Fedder · Guiding Homeroom and Club Activities
Fernald · Remedial Techniques in Basic School Subjects
Forest · Early Years at School
Good · Dictionary of Education
Hagman · The Administration of American Public Schools
Hammonds · Teaching Agriculture
Heck · The Education of Exceptional Children
Hoppock · Group Guidance
Jordan · Measurement in Education
Kaulfers · Modern Language for Modern Schools
McCullough, Strang, and Traxler · Problems in the Improvement of Reading
McKown · Activities in the Elementary School
McKown · Home Room Guidance
McKown and Roberts · Audio-Visual Aids to Instruction
McNerney · The Curriculum

McNerney · Educational Supervision
Macomber · Teaching in the Modern Secondary School
Mays · Essentials of Industrial Education
Mays · Principles and Practices of Vocational Education
Melvin · General Methods of Teaching
Micheels and Karnes · Measuring Educational Achievement
Millard and Huggett · An Introduction to Elementary Education
Mort · Principles of School Administration
Mort and Reusser · Public School Finance
Mort and Vincent · Introduction to American Education
Mort and Vincent · Modern Educational Practice
Mursell · Developmental Teaching
Mursell · Successful Teaching
Myers · Principles and Techniques of Vocational Guidance
Pittenger · Local Public School Administration
Remmlein · The Law of Local Public School Administration
Remmlein · School Law
Richey · Planning for Teaching
Samford and Cottle · Social Studies in the Secondary School
Sanford, Hand and Spalding · The Schools and National Security
Schorling · Student Teaching
Schorling and Wingo · Elementary-school Student Teaching
Sears · The Nature of the Administrative Process
Smith, Standley, and Hughes · Junior High School Education
Sorenson · Psychology in Education
Thorpe · Psychological Foundations of Personality
Thut and Gerberich · Foundations of Method for Secondary Schools
Tidyman and Butterfield · Teaching the Language Arts
Warters · High-school Personnel Work Today
Weber · Personnel Problems of School Administrators
Wells · Elementary Science Education
Wells · Secondary Science Education
Wilson, Stone, and Dalrymple · Teaching the New Arithmetic
Winslow · Art in Elementary Education
Winslow · The Integrated School Art Program

The Nature of the Administrative Process

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

JESSE B. SEARS

Stanford University, California

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

New York Toronto London 1950

THE NATURE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

Copyright, 1950, by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publishers.

III

MESTON TRAINING COLLEGE
12
MADRAS-14

THE MAPLE PRESS COMPANY, YORK, PA.

To My Sons
Robert and Norman
This Book Is
Affectionately Dedicated

PREFACE

This book is an attempt to find a more fundamental basis than we now have for the criticism and improvement of administrative practice. To that end it offers the results of an inquiry into the nature of the administrative process. The study was undertaken in the hope that by a close scrutiny of all the elements and aspects of the activity, separately and in combination, further light might be thrown upon what makes administration good or bad.

Though new to the field of school administration, the approach here used has been applied in the fields of business and government administration, beginning with the work of Frederick W. Taylor in this country and Henry Fayol in France—both of the late nineteenth century—and currently well exemplified by a collection of papers, *Papers on the Science of Administration*, edited by Luther M. Gulick and L. Urwick.

Such analyses, properly applied in different fields, should stimulate interest in a comparative study of administration, now so obviously needed if we are to develop a science of administration. Administration needs a sounder and more widely understood underlying philosophy as well as a more comprehensive and thorough analysis and interpretation of the facts of practice if basic principles are to be developed and distinguished from mere tricks of the trade.

No writer can pretend to equal acquaintance and expertness in all the realms of administration, public, private, and legal, so essential to a thorough comparative study; hence, the use of a limiting subtitle for this book. If searches have led the writer somewhat afield from educational administration at points, neither vanity nor ambition to instruct authorities in other fields has prompted the digression. It is made only in an effort to open this field and method of study to

students of school administration, as they have been already fruitfully explored by engineers, jurists, and political scientists for their several fields. If, by illuminating one more realm of administration, this study should also contribute a little to the broader movement toward a science of administration, that would doubly reward the efforts that have been made.

This study was prompted, besides, by a conviction that administration could be greatly improved if its real nature were better understood. As to its main weaknesses, the writer has some convictions, formed from a long and somewhat extensive experience in firsthand study of school administrative practice. These convictions are that administrative practice is trying to operate in terms of conflicting underlying assumptions, which it does not adequately examine or frankly admit using; and that administration is very much more complex in nature than most people realize. It seemed reasonable, therefore, to think that a close scrutiny of the process, carried on with continuous watchfulness for the implications of any underlying—perhaps hidden—assumptions, might enable us to overcome some of the difficulties by striking at their roots.

If, for one task, the investigator assumes that administration derives its nature from authority and from the nature of man himself as an organizer and director of men, and, in another task, he assumes that its nature is derived from the nature of the work it is authorized to perform, then conflict within the system is inevitable. One of these approaches thinks of administration as a thing in itself, a machine, as it were, brought in from the outside or from somewhere above and responsible, not to its work, but only to the authority that creates it. The other approach would build the administrative process not out of some superpower, but out of the needs for organization, direction, and leadership to be found by a study of the job to be done. The one would look to itself and its authority for its inspiration; the other, to the needs of the children in schools. While the one would lay

most stress upon authority, the other would put the greatest stress upon knowledge.

The task set for this book was to develop a closer acquaintance with the administrative process in all its parts and aspects, from its inception to the end product of its efforts, from its underlying assumptions to its avowed purposes, acts, and outcomes. To accomplish this wide survey, the task—and accordingly the book—was divided into three parts: Part I, which is devoted to an examination at close range of the administrative process itself; Part II, which in similar manner deals with the forces used, together with some of the ways in which those forces may be employed for energizing and shaping the process; and Part III, which is given to a consideration of the subject matter by which the process may be learned.

The major divisions of the school administrative process were not difficult to identify, and no reason was found for departing significantly from Fayol's classification, applied earlier in the field of public administration. One has only to mention planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling as the major divisions of the process, to sense what inevitably must be chapter headings of Part I of this book. Fayol's term "command," if not identical in content, is readily recognized as more than parallel to the term "direction" as used here. It is not so much in making the general breakdown of the process, however, but only as the inquiry burrows more deeply into the intricacies of these separate activities, that one comes upon newer food for thought in this study. By pursuing this closer scrutiny, one begins to sense the presence of mistaken identities, of tricky definitions used, of hidden assumptions, and of other unseen and unrecognized forces at work as determiners of action. Only in this closer contact, too, does one discover how dependent each of these major activities is upon the others, how inseparable they all are from the work that they are set to do, and how very complex they are in themselves.

One cannot examine the administrative process in such

detail without asking, "What makes it go?" Study of the process reveals the presence of a mechanism, but a mechanism that is not mere form or structure but something that is much alive. Part II of the book is concerned, therefore, with the nature of the forces that energize administration—what they are and what their nature is; whence they are derived; in what forms or through what devices they can be applied; to what kind of tasks each is best fitted; and how, if need arises, they can be combined for use. Authority derived from law; knowledge, derived from observation and study; social usage, derived from life in our culture and expressed as cultural standards and specialized as our professional ethics—these are the available forms and sources of energy. These energies are examined for what they are, for what they can do, and for some special ways of using them.

Finally, since a knowledge of administration is of value only if its teachings can be acquired and applied by those who seek careers in this service, we must be concerned with the task of locating and organizing and learning the subject matter of the field. To be a good administrator, what must one know? Where can he find this knowledge? How is he to develop the needed attitudes and skills, the personality and character through which the right knowledge is to be applied to tasks? One cannot read the literature of this field, cannot even note just the titles of the great classics that are listed in the bibliographies of this book—to say nothing of hundreds of more recent studies, general and technical—without realizing two things: (1) that there is a great literature, a vast accumulation of knowledge, upon this subject which reveals what men have learned and, so, what the novice must learn if he is to hold a place in this profession; (2) that this literature is an increasingly powerful factor in determining the nature of the evolving administrative process.

But process and energized mechanism and their subject matter are not all. There is yet to be reckoned with the in-

fluence of man himself. Throughout the study, man's nature claims attention: man, a person; man, in a society of men and responsive to the likes and wishes of his fellows; man, the administrator with authority, with intelligence and knowledge, with cultural standards ingrained in personality; but also, man, independent, with the capacity to choose whenever law and ethics cannot or do not fully point the way. Those through whom administration effects its ends are persons, too, and thus the complication grows. But to poets and philosophers, the Popes and Casserers, and to other generations of psychologists this puzzling problem of human nature must be left. If this essay should help a little to clarify the nature of the administrative process and to explain the laws by which it does its work; if it has brought to light, even though it has not fully answered, the main questions raised by its search for the precise place for human personality in administration; if it has indicated a proper line of approach and outlined a procedure for developing an appropriate subject matter for the field, then it will not have failed its purpose.

Excursions in search of light upon the problems encountered in this study have been wide and far-ranging. The writer's debt is acknowledged to many ancient as well as modern writers, far too many of them not mentioned, and he counts it a part of the contribution of this work to have brought together the literature of the subject and to bring to the attention of school administrators such an array of important names and titles as that set forth in the footnotes and bibliographies of the book.

JESSE B. SEARS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.
July, 1950

CONTENTS

PREFACE viii

Part I: An Analysis of the Administrative Process

1. STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 3

   The Field and Subject Matter of School Administration—Approaches to a Study of the Field of School Administration—Analysis of the Field for Purposes of Study—Approaches to a Study of the Administrative Process—Study of the Origin and Aims of the Administrative Function—Study of the Nature of the Administrative Process

2. PLANNING AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 39

   Definition of the Planning Function—Need for Planning in Administrative Work—Classification of Planning Needs—The Nature of the Planning Process—Other Factors That Influence the Process—Arrangements for the Planning Service

3. ORGANIZATION AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 87

   Wide Application of the Term Organization—Relation of Paper to Human Machinery in School Organization—Opposing Theories of Organization—Typical Ways of Thinking of Organization—Foundations of an Organization—Other Crucial Elements in an Organization—Organization's Protection against Interferences

4. DIRECTING AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 125

   Common and Technical Usages of the Term Direction—Functional Analysis Not the Sole Basis for Job Assignment—Activities Involved in Direction—Direction and Other Processes Closely Interrelated—Authority as an Element in Direction—Knowledge as an Element in Direction—The Nature of Direction as Reflected in Its Behavior—Direction through a Hierarchy—Unified *vs.* Divided Direction

5. COORDINATION AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 161

   Coordination as an Aspect of Administration—Approaches to a Study of Coordination—The Study of Cases—Coordination

in Advance and as Remedial Treatment—The Forces by Which Coordination May Be Effected—The Nature of the Coordinating Process

6. CONTROL AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 203

The Term Control and Its Use in Administration—The Nature of Control as Effected through Legal Authority—The Nature of Control as Effected through Facts and Principles—The Nature of Control as Effected through Professional Ethics and Social Proprieties—Instruments, Devices, and Methods of Control—The Rule Book a Major Instrument of Control—Salary Schedule as a Control—The Building Program as a Control—The Program of Instruction as a Control—More Specialized Controls through Technical Devices—Applying the Control Principle in Management—Summary of Steps in the Analysis

Part II: The Nature and Use of Certain Forces Essential in the Administrative Process

7. THE NATURE AND PLACE OF AUTHORITY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION 249

Administrative Power Includes More than the Authority of Law—The Nature of the Authority of Law—The Use of Authority in Administration—Some Implications and Applications of These Ideas

8. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION.... 283

Nature of the Power that Operates the Schools—Two-way Application of the Division-of-labor principle—Difficulties of Applying the Division-of-labor Principle—Questions Involved in the Delegation of Authority—First Step in Delegating—An Analysis of the Work to Be Done—Second Step—Determining Type of Administration Desired—Third Step—Provision for Use and Flow of Knowledge—Fourth Step—Clear Definition of Powers Delegated

9. THE NATURE AND PLACE OF POLICY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION 307

The Realm of Administration—Uses of the Word Policy—The Nature of Administrative Policy—Giving Form to a Policy—The Development of Administrative Policies—Similarities and Differences in Needs of Large and Small Districts—A General

Over-all Policy for All Schools—Common Centers about Which a System of Policies May Be Constructed for All School Systems Alike

10. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND SOCIAL USAGE AS ELEMENTS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS 357

Complexity of Administrative Work—Discretion and Responsibility in Administration—Some Practical Implications of Discretion in Administration—On Compelling Men to Be Responsible—On Encouraging and Assisting Men to Be Responsible—On Responsibility Self-willed—Where Responsibility Often Fails to Function—Keeping the Law Abreast and Active—Keeping Social Forces at Work—Keeping Ourselves Responsible

11. ADMINISTRATION'S CONTACT WITH SUPERIOR AUTHORITY—A PARTIAL ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN LOCAL SCHOOL GOVERNMENT 395

The School Board as a Government Agency—The General Character of School-board Work—The Field of Legislation in Local School Systems—Types and Methods of Legislative Work—Case Study of the Nature of the Legislative Process—Administration's Contact with the Legislative Process

Part III: The Subject Matter of Public School Administration—Its Nature and Sources

12. OUR APPROACH TO A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF SUBJECT MATTER 447

The Study of Subject Matter an Essential Part of an Inquiry into the Natures of the Administrative Process—Bases for Choosing Subject Matter—Sciences That May Throw Light upon These Problems—The Order of Approach and the Method of Choosing Materials from These Sources

13. SOURCES FROM WHICH ADMINISTRATION'S SUBJECT MATTER MUST BE DRAWN 487

The Subject Matter of Administration, As Such—Subject Matter from Political Science—Subject Matter from the Realm of Law—Subject Matter from the Fields of Engineering and Business Administration—Subject Matter from Anthropology and Sociology—Subject Matter from the Field of Psychology

14. Summary with a Look Ahead as to Subject Matter for This Field 545
Summary of Part III—Problems Ahead

Bibliographies 571

Group I for Parts I and II 574
Concerned with the Problems of Parts I and II on the Nature of the Administrative Process

Group II for Part III 592
Concerned with the Nature and Sources of Subject Matter for the Field of Public School Administration

Index 605

Part I

An Analysis of the Administrative Process

Chapter 1. STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

This chapter provides a general setting and states the problem of the book. Its purpose is to lay the foundation for a study of the administrative process.

By way of approach, the term administration is defined and the usages of it in various fields are compared. How such a function must have originated; how and when we began to study its problems; how its subject matter has been built up; how the philosophical and the scientific aspects of the study came to light, each with its appropriate method of study; how the literature of the field has developed and how it reflects the organization for administration in practice—all are reviewed as background or first steps in an approach to the study.

From these preliminaries thought turns directly to the question of how to study the administrative process. The importance of a study of origins is noted. Attention is given to the danger of confusing means with ends and of viewing administration too much as authority alone, or as mechanism, or as isolated practical tasks, and of considering it too little in its relation to other services and to instructional objectives—a method that leads to the conclusion that administration has meaning only when it is thought of in action, and that it is good only when the instructional service is attaining its proper ends.

With this as a tentative hypothesis, the chapter undertakes the first major step in its analysis by noting five clearly definable forms of activity—planning, organizing, directing,

coordinating, and controlling—as constituting the process as a whole. Finally, it is shown that each of these is a distinctive form of activity, that it is related to all the others when at work, and that its effectiveness depends upon its proper use of authority, knowledge, custom, and personality.

1. The Field and Subject Matter of School Administration[1]

Meaning of the term administration. The field of school administration is relatively new as a special realm of study, though the practice is almost as old as civilization. In common usage, the term administration is roughly synonymous with that of management. In its proper use in education, it contains much that we mean by the word government and is closely related in content to such words as superintendence, supervision, planning, oversight, direction, organization, control, guidance, and regulation. Besides referring to the process or activity of managing people and materials, the term is regularly used to designate the person or persons, the officials, in charge of the activity.

The types of activities covered by the term administration, as it applies in the field of education, are similar—or at least quite parallel—to those covered by it in government, in industry and commerce, in institutions of religion, and in social clubs. This similarity is not so great in the actual work done or the detail of methods used, perhaps, as it is in the nature of the energizing power used, the arrangements for its use, and the effect this power has upon the nature, the operations, and the success of the enterprise.[2]

General similarity of purpose assures, therefore, that a

[1] The object of this study is not to prove a thesis but to discover the basic principles upon which to base a theory of public school administration. For this reason the footnotes of the book are as often citations to broad basic matters of a background nature as to specific authority for or discussion of the point under discussion.

[2] Luther H. Gulick, "Science Values in Public Administration." In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

study of administration in any one of these fields must inevitably cover much, in principle at least, that would be essential in any of the other fields.[3] This apparent similarity may be misleading if one tries to carry it very far, for, obviously, training in municipal government would not equip a man to administer a school system or to direct the operations of a church or a factory or a bank. So, with the similarities there are important differences as well. The implications of these similarities and differences for a comprehensive theory, or for a general science of administration, have not as yet been examined carefully or at all extensively. Until this has been done, we shall not be sure whether what we call administrative principles are in reality principles or only particular inferences or, perhaps, only tricks of the special trade.[4]

Administration in its simplest form. The function of administration appears in a very simple form when someone waves or calls out a heave-ho signal, thereby directing the efforts of the many to carry on in unison to a common end. In more complicated processes, where the task involves several types of activities, specialization of work appears, and with this come planning and organization and coordination, as well as simple directing. Undoubtedly the function has developed through long centuries of time, largely by

[3] Oliver Sheldon, *The Philosophy of Management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1930. Concerned with administration in industry, but his analysis of the field and problems is illuminating for all fields of administration. Dr. John Fairlie has traced the development of our study of public administration in *Essays on the Law and Practice of Governmental Administration in Memory of Frank J. Goodnow,* Charles G. Haines and Marshall Dimock (Eds.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.

[4] John Lee, "The Parallels between Industrial Administration and Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 4:216–222, July, 1926. See also C. Bertrand Thompson, *The Theory and Practice of Scientific Management.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917. The latter offers extensive bibliography of publications in the engineering field, to that date.

trial and error; but when an activity reaches the point where planning has become an obvious need, it is inevitable that that activity will soon become an object of systematic study and, if important enough, may become a separate subject or university discipline.

Administration attained importance in government long before it did in education or in business; and as a branch of study, it first came to light in the field of political science and in the engineering activities of states. Its appearance as a separate study in business and in education hardly dates back to the middle of last century. Reference here is to the beginning of formal study in school and to a body of literature,[5] including systematic treatises, researches, and highly organized bodies of information, and not to the time when men first tried to think of better ways in managing. Men have always studied their problems; and since men first wrote down their thoughts, government has been a chief object of study. But it is one thing to try to find the quickest way to get an army across a stream and a different thing to plan and build a bridge across the stream, and it is a still different thing to prepare a treatise and to give formal instruction covering the facts and principles of engineering involved in bridge construction.

Development of a literature on the subject of administration. The first attempts to formulate a body of knowledge to *cover* the problems of management in any field were unavoidably crude. This was true in education, first, because the function of management had to be isolated from a jumbled complex of activities; and second, because the function tended to change rapidly, not only as a result of rapidly growing school systems, but also because, as the

[5] Charles Austin Beard, *Philosophy, Science and Art of Public Administration.* Address, Annual Conference of Governmental Research Association, Princeton, N.J., 1939. Also, see Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration Columbia University, 1937.

function was studied, it was constantly being reshaped to fit new conditions and new concepts of education itself. It is not surprising, therefore, that it has taken time to find and develop the subject matter and to locate the limits of the field; nor can anyone hope for an end to this problem as long as we accept what seems an obvious fact, that we live in a changing world—and not a static one.

Gradually, however, there has been accumulated a substantial body of knowledge about administration as a separate function.[6] This applies alike and quite independently to the fields of government, of business, and of education. We now can define administration fairly well; we can enumerate its major problems; we can describe its processes; we can explain its relations to other functions; we can describe the materials, the tools, and the techniques it uses; and we can explain how it is energized. Facts about these matters and principles drawn from a study of the facts, together with the purposes we pursue or the values we seek to obtain through study, are its subject matter. We refer to the body of facts and to the principles derived from a study of the facts, together with the methods and techniques used to analyze and interpret the facts, as a science;[7] and to the study of the values sought,[8] or recognized in the process, as a philosophy or as a theory of administration.

Comparative study of administration needed. In government, business, and education, alike, there are endless variations in types of enterprises to be administered. States vary

[6] B. W. Walker Watson, "The Elements of Public Administration—A Dogmatic Introduction." *Public Administration,* 10:397–408, October, 1932; also, F. Merson, "Public Administration: a Science." *Public Administration,* 1:220–227, 1923.

[7] E. O. Stene, "An Approach to a Science of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1124–1137, December, 1940. See also, Oliver Sheldon, *The Philosophy of Management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1923.

[8] Herbert A. Simon, "The Proverbs of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 6:53–67, Winter, 1946.

in size and population, in their traditions and current cultural aims and processes, in their physical and economic resources, in their security against possible enemies, in their scientific advancement; and they vary also in their concepts of government. Business enterprises are still more varied. In education we have private venture, church, philanthropic, and government types of school systems, each in almost endless variety as to purpose, as well as to size and program and to the population served. In all these enterprises, administration is a necessary feature, but its ends and processes must be greatly varied to fit the management needs of such widely different enterprises.

If administration is one of the necessary functions through which the work of an institution is carried on, it is obvious that, whatever part or element of administration we study, we shall find it in wide variety of form or expression as we move from the realm of government to that of business or that of education, or as we move from a small to a large enterprise, as from a small liberal-arts college to a great, endowed university or a state school system or a city school system or a large, independent high school or a small private kindergarten. In all alike, there must be management—to fix upon purposes, to provide personnel and materials, and to plan for and organize and direct the program of activities. Further, this managing can go on only if someone is possessed of authority to decide and to command. In all these basic matters, administration is everywhere the same, whether in government or business or education, whether in a great and complex enterprise like a nation or a small and simple one like a department store or a village school system.[9]

[9] Principal Grant Robertson, "The Future of Administrative Science." *Public Administration,* 4:8–11, 1926. See also C. Reinold Noyes, "The Law and Scientific Method." *Political Science Quarterly,* 55:496–521, December, 1940. Also Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration." *Political Science Quarterly,* 56:481–506, December, 1941.

The subject matter of the field. To put it briefly, the subject matter of school administration has to do with the following matters:

1. Establishing educational purposes by expressing them in the form of aims and a program of work to be accomplished, *e.g.*, laying out its work.
2. The development and organization of a personnel and the necessary finances, housing, materials, and facilities for carrying on the work.
3. The procedures and techniques for the performance of the work, including the policies and the plans to guide it.
4. The nature and use of the authority (legal, scientific, social, and personal) by which administration operates.
5. The origin and nature of the aims and processes by which administration operates.
6. The nature of the mechanism by which authority and knowledge are applied in the process of administration.

Of these six items, it will be seen that the first three have to do more with the practice of administration, while the latter three have to do more with the theory or philosophy underlying the practice. The subject matter of the former would include facts and explanations pertaining to the ways and means of carrying on an educational service, whereas the subject matter of the latter would be composed of concepts, hypotheses, theories, principles, propositions, and facts, about the nature of the administrative activity—its origin, its power, its mechanism, its processes, its objectives, the reasons for its existence, and what makes it good or bad. The former subject matter could not be solely descriptive, because the tasks of administration are too varied and changing for any fixed and single pattern of treatment; nor could that of the latter be so abstract as to require no reference to the facts of practice. Rather, each is an aspect or a part of a total enterprise or activity, including (for school administration) educational service (teaching, care, and counseling of

children, together with supporting activities, such as supervision, research, and public relations); the management of the forces and materials and personnel that produce the service; and the theory by which the managing activity is conceived and held true to its task.

If the real substance or nature of administration were to be found in a single pattern of action, the guiding principles of which were embodied in a set of rules and devices, then one could learn administration, once for all, and could teach the whole of it to others; or he could go here or there, to any task, and apply it with assurance that the work would be accomplished economically and with dispatch. To be a good administrator, one would not need to know the theory back of this pattern of rules. But administration's problems are not this simple. The nature of the service to be administered seems, rather, to dictate what pattern of rules one can use. Accordingly, instead of being equipped by learning a pattern of rules, the administrator finds that he is compelled to learn how to construct a pattern of rules for the particular service in question. To be able to do this, one must know the nature, *i.e.*, the theory and philosophy of administration.

By the most arbitrary view of administration one might wish to study each of these three fields (education, management, theory of management) as if it were capable of separate and independent treatment. There are other views that would regard them as so basically and so intricately related as to make separate treatment impossible and meaningless. Whether the three represent independent, or closely related, fields of study need not detain us at this point. It is clear enough that, whatever the bearing each of the three may have upon the others, it is possible, at least, to study any one of them as a field or as a problem and to develop a subject matter pertaining to it. How much the subject matter of the one may be a part of that of the others should be revealed by study and not by the imposition of arbitrary views or definitions.

2. *Approaches to a Study of the Field of School Administration*[10]

The first steps. In entering upon a study, it is common procedure to choose a limited field to work in; within that field, to choose a problem as a point for beginning; and then to select methods by which to carry on the study. Closely related to both choice of problem and choice of method is the question of how one starts to work. It is one thing to start with clearly defined concepts, with all the pertinent facts, and with proved principles; but it is a different thing to start *de novo,* or to start with tentative hypotheses and with hidden assumptions, and with only part of the facts.

To start work on a single problem without knowing where the problem lies in the total field is to start with too few facts and without a basis for judging the importance of the problem. The field of school administrative practice is now so well laid out for study that, within its borders, one need not lack this kind of orientation. The field of administrative theory is less well explored.[11] The system of paths, so familiar in the field of practice, is here, as yet, undeveloped. That studies of practice need the support of studies of theory is as obvious as that the study of theory cannot hope to get far without wide use of the facts of practice. This is merely to stress the point that school administration is one field, not two or twenty, and that to approach any part of the field or any problem in it without keeping this unity in mind is to overlook the most important step in approaching it for study.

Method of study. There are two general approaches to the study of anything. One works mainly with facts; the other, mainly with concepts, propositions, and reasoning.

[10] See Marshall Edward Dimock, "Study of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:28–40, February, 1937.

[11] Egbert S. Wengert, "The Study of Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 36:313–322, April, 1942. See also Jesse B. Sears, "Analysis of School Administrative Controls." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 20:401–430, September, 1934.

The one identifies, assembles, classifies, counts, measures, compares, and interprets facts, with a view to establishing general truths, whereas the other starts with general truths and by use of them tries to identify and learn the nature or meaning of individual facts and relations. The former, inductive procedure, is well suited to a study of administrative practice; the latter, deductive procedure, to a study of theory. To some extent, however, the two are but separate phases and they are used together in most studies. Either method can be used as a means of trying to solve the problems of practice, and both can be used in a search for guiding principles or theories.

The implications of these approaches are of some importance. By starting with a study of facts (about purposes and practice) one tacitly assumes that right methods and theories are inherent in the nature of the facts of experience in the practice, and that one can discover theory or find right principles and ways to administer by studying the activity itself. In a sense this assumption proposes to discover theory by mining it out, by extracting its truths from the purposes and practices, the facts and relationships, of education at work.[12]

By starting with principles, one tacitly assumes that the basic principles that are essential to a theory of administration are already known, such principles being universally accepted truths or axioms. Such general truths or propositions, once established or accepted, can be used either as a means of building up a scheme of practice, or as a means of testing or evaluating the rightness of the existing practice. In inductive study, one has to be careful to make sure that he has taken account of all the facts that are pertinent in the case and is doing so; in deductive study, one has to be careful in his use of words and in his process of reasoning, lest he fall into any of the many possible fallacies of logic.

There could be no point in comparing these two methods

[12] E. O. Stene, "An Approach to a Science of Administration." *The American Political Science Review*, 34:1124–1137, December, 1940.

of work here, either as to their relative value or as to the difficulty of their use in studying a problem in social science, such as, for instance, that of the administration of education. They are both useful, each in its proper place, and both are difficult to use in proportion to the extent and complexity of the problem or field to which they are applied.[13] One chooses the facts he wishes to study, but one also chooses the principles or propositions he wishes to use. It is difficult in either case to be wholly objective, to keep separate one's own personal likes, ideas, whims, prejudices, knowledge, abilities, and ignorance and to restrain them from having influence on the choice. The nature of one's facts, too, affects the case. Social facts are less definite, ultimate, and unchanging than are most physical facts and, for that reason, are more difficult to treat with exactness.

Assumptions. In approaching a study of administration, one may be guided by much or by little experience or precise knowledge. In either case he will choose some point from which to start his work, and back of his choice there will be certain interests and certain assumptions that determine his choice and that guide his procedure. In the study of administration, one may proceed on the assumption that the ways of organizing, directing, and doing all the things that administration does are decided mainly by applying authority according to principles that are derived from a study of administration itself. Although some would say that administration must facilitate teaching and learning, yet this viewpoint assumes that, in developing principles, the object of administration, the work it does, its raw materials, or its product need not be considered. Figuratively speaking, this procedure would claim that one devises his administrative mechanism and then takes it to a school or a district and sets it going. A diametrically opposite assumption would claim that one develops his theory of how to adminis-

[13] William Anderson and John M. Gaus, *Research in Public Administration.* New York: Social Science Research Council, Committee on Public Administration, 1945.

ter by beginning at the opposite end, *viz.*, with the object of administration, with schools and the nature of education—the laws of learning and teaching. One who takes this stand also assumes that the proper end of administration is to facilitate the working of these laws. Thus, by studying the learning, teaching, counseling, supervision, and research activities (education itself), one learns how best to organize the schools and how best to direct and control operations and, in time, may develop principles or a theory of administration.[14]

The former assumption would study the laws and regulations by which the schools exist; it would watch the behavior of the authority of law as it operated in organization and direction and, by a study of the administrative mechanism and operations, would hope in time to develop principles of administration. The latter assumption would start by undertaking a study of the children and teachers at work.[15] By such study it would discover how to group children, how to program their work, how to assign teachers, how to plan school buildings, how to handle the purpose and distribution of supplies, *i.e.*, how to administer the schools so as to facilitate learning and teaching. It would apply the authority of law, but merely as a means to this end. That is, law would be secondary to science, to a knowledge of educational activities, as a source from which to derive administrative principles.

[14] Egbert S. Wengert, "The Study of Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review*, 36:313–322, April, 1942. See also Gordon D. Clapp, "Toward a Science of Administration." *Public Administration Review*, 1:82–84, Autumn, 1940.

[15] The mechanism and process of school administration are features of our culture. As such they must have originated in some need for action and decision concerned with carrying on the work of education. This idea that *need* is the starting point for any scientific study of the nature of administration is not only common sense but is consistent with exhaustive application and test of the worth of this approach in the field of cultural anthropology. See Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

Not many educators would go so far with the former assumption as to consider administration to be totally self-contained, an end in itself. Such a viewpoint would be similar to that of statism, in the sense that its rules can be made without consideration of its citizens, that is, without any study of how children work and play and live together as learners. It regards the welfare of the children as ends, but it assumes that one can devise an administrative mechanism and procedures that will properly safeguard those ends merely by studying the power, machinery, and problems of management itself.

A third assumption is that each of these two approaches can and must be used as a partial support and a partial check upon the other. Probably most school administrators would claim this as their view. Acceptance of it as a guiding principle in the study of administration can mean much or little. Certainly it does not tell one how far to go in either direction, or how or where to apply the one or the other of the views. Obviously, if by study of the children one concluded that a large number of children needed psychiatric and medical care and nourishing food and better home conditions, one would be faced with the law covering the responsibilities of the schools in these matters. The two approaches can come into conflict quite easily. If board rules do not require the superintendent to confer with teachers on matters of policy affecting their work or their compensation, then the superintendent could—and some would—ignore the teachers, in spite of the fact that our other assumption would require that teachers participate.

This may serve to remind us that, however much we may wish to be scientific, in the sense that we try to face all pertinent facts, we shall have to be very watchful if we are not in fact guided by assumptions that have not been thoroughly examined and carefully formulated. One may be guided by established laws, by theories, by hypotheses, or by assumptions. In any case, what we believe in needs to be tested for its implications for use in guiding school activ-

ities. We can find plenty of administrative practices that rest upon beliefs in old prejudices or old worn-out dogmas, traditions, and habits, and that are wholly in defiance of the proper facts and concepts of educational science as we now know them.

3. *Analysis of the Field for Purposes of Study*

Breakdown of field for study. One may study the field of school administration as a whole or part by part or by separate aspects, as he may choose. If one undertook to study the field as a whole, he would be interested in all administrative service devoted to education in any and all forms. There would be administration of education in schools and school systems, and administration of any and all kinds of activities that contribute less formally and less directly to actual instruction, but, nonetheless, that serve some educational ends.

The field of formal school education breaks down readily by types of control, as, public, parochial, private-venture, and endowed schools; or by type of instruction offered, as elementary, secondary, higher, and special education—such as technical, industrial, commerical, preschool, adult, and for atypical groups. Public education breaks down readily into federal, state, county, and local districts; the latter, into rural, village, and city systems.

This analysis could go far beyond this, even to a minute classification of the administrative divisions of a school or a school system.[16] To explore so broad a field, except for general survey purposes, would be a large undertaking; but if one's interest is to build a science of administration, such a survey would have one advantage, in that it would afford wide opportunity for comparative study of problems and, by providing exposure to the entire field, would tend to prevent generalization on the basis of too small a sampling of fact. So far, aside from a very few textbooks, our literature reveals

[16] E. N. Gladden, "On the Study of Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 24:191–195, Autumn, 1946.

no attempt to deal with the subject in so comprehensive a manner as this.

How the field has been treated in the literature on the subject. Most of the material that treats of this field has dealt with one or more parts of the field only or with one or more of the separate aspects or problems of the field. Most of the studies that have been made and most of the general treatises have been concerned with how to administer; as, how to administer a state school system or the schools of a county or those of a city, or an individual school (university, high school, elementary school); or how to administer some one phase, such as, finance, business, personnel, guidance research, public relations, supervision, cafeteria service, plant development, health, athletics, or records and reports. In all alike, the object has been to find out how to administer or how to give directions for carrying on the work. Interest in the theory of administration has not been lacking, but usually such interest has been secondary, and often enough it has been quite arbitrarily disposed of, being implied or settled by direct assertion or superficial argument.

Points of view and interests stressed in the literature. In recent years we have had extensive discussion and writing, often vociferous shouting, about democracy in administration or the lack of it. In this literature one finds pages upon pages of complaint—almost name calling—and of arbitrary assertion, but a dearth of careful study of facts and principles. By it we may have been more emotionalized than informed. It remains to be seen whether we have been stirred to search for the true nature of administration in a democracy[17] or merely confused and annoyed by cheap harangue.

Another characteristic of the literature on school administration, to date, is that it is concerned—and from every

[17] Roscoe Pound, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. See also Charles E. Merriam, "The Assumptions of Democracy." *Political Science Quarterly,* 53:328–349, September, 1938.

standpoint, very properly concerned—with how to get the school work done: how to organize a staff or a curriculum, how to make a budget, how to coordinate guidance with instruction, how to plan a building program, how to deal with the Federal government, how to maintain a high morale in the staff or the student body, how to manage a cafeteria service, how to keep records, how to care for pupil transportation, how to conduct a bond election, how to formulate a policy, and who shall have power to decide and to act in this case and in that. All this has been so pressing that we have had little time to study the process of administering as such. It is one thing to look carefully at a job with a view to finding how to do it, and a different thing to look at the process of doing the job with a view to finding evidence of the suitability or unfitness of the process for doing it.[18]

The reason for our having given less thought to this latter approach is obvious. We usually have adopted or discarded an administrative procedure in accordance with its having produced good or poor results. The results were accepted as a measure of worth, and one could hardly object to this. However, it is conceivable that by a careful study of the administrative process one might find, in the nature of the process itself, clear evidence of why it could be expected to fail to do the work in one case or to succeed in another. That is, by knowing all about our tool we might be able to use it so wisely that it would seldom fail us. A saw works well in felling a tree but serves badly for driving a nail. If administrative authority is applied to a task for which science or skill is needed, it, too, will go badly, and vice versa.

Which of these two approaches is more important for study? To this the answer is that it is not a question of

[18] Broadly suggestive is F. F. Blachly and M. E. Oatman, "A New Approach to the Reform of Regulatory Procedure." *Georgetown Law Journal,* 32:325–374, May, 1944.

either or. Both are indispensable. The latter, having received little attention so far, is just now the more in need of exploring. To study the process itself, however, one must think in terms of action, not of mechanism; of administration going on, producing decisions, and ordering and directing how work shall be done.[19] To separate administration from the work it is doing would be to destroy it as action or process; so, to study the process, we must look into the stream of administrative activity, at the work and the process of doing it, to find our data.

4. Approaches to a Study of the Administrative Process

Practice vs. theory as our center of interest. If one is to study the practice of administration, it is apparent from experience to date, as already explained, that the field can be laid out in large or small areas on any number of separate bases, and that these areas can be further subdivided in endless ways to fit one's interest; or one may approach this task, not as a field for study, but as any one of many special problems to be solved. Our literature abounds in studies, both of fields broad and narrow and of problems large and small. Because our literature is concerned with how to conduct schools, it must of necessity be largely descriptive and factual in treatment and be concerned more with concrete cases, with solutions of problems, than with theories about the solutions. This, however, is only a matter of emphasis; for in all the major studies and treatises the question of theory has been raised more often, perhaps, as a secondary than as a primary purpose of the study, but most of what we have of theory has been built up in this way.

Since the literature devoted strictly to a study of the theory of administration is scant and recent, it is not strange

[19] James M. Landis, *The Administrative Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. See also Thomas F. Konop, "The Advent of the Administrative Process and Its Future." *Notre Dame Lawyer,* 16:155–182, March, 1941.

that, so far, we do not find this field so well laid out for study.[20] It might be possible to attain a high degree of perfection in school administration by a trial-and-error procedure alone, applied to its practical problems as they might arise; but after enough generations have made trials and accumulated experience and errors on a matter of importance, it is inevitable that attention will turn to the question of why—why success here, or failure there; what is it that makes administration good or bad in a given case?

If administration is governed by personal whim alone, then—perhaps, short of an explanation of human nature with all its frailties—there could be no theory that would satisfactorily explain practice. But, administration is not so unstable as that. Administration is something made to order; it rests upon a studied foundation; it is designed for a purpose; its powers and limitations are calculated in advance; it is responsible; its nature is reasonably constant; and its behavior can be anticipated. This, at least, is what we commonly believe, despite the occasional big or little despot who defies all reason and trusts more to power than to reason and fact.

In our search for a theory of administration, we must study practice, however secure we may feel in our use of certain general truths or axioms, such as those by which we justify our system of free schools. In our study of practice, we have examined administration at work on its problems, and to some extent we have worked with our axioms—our basic underlying principles—with a view to making our school government conform to and express those principles.

[20] It is only as a science develops some degree of maturity that we can expect textbook treatments of theories that go beyond generalities. Note the added attention given to theory in recent textbooks on school administration. See Arthur B. Moehlman, *School Administration—Its Development, Principles, and Future in the United States.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940; Paul Mort, *Principles of School Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1946; and Jesse B. Sears, *Public School Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947.

Although, as an art, school administration is old, as a science it is still quite new;[21] however, and for this reason, the field of practice still has in it some unexplored areas. To date, we have not gone far in a study of the nature of the administrative process itself, alone and apart from what it is doing. It is conceivable, even a fair guess, that our successes and failures are almost as much explained by the nature of the administrative process as by the nature of the work it performs. In any case, it is to the task of studying this process itself directly, as such, that we are here devoted.

The purpose and the problem of this book. To enter upon a study of the administrative process we must have a purpose. As broad and general purposes, we may adopt either or both of the following. One is to satisfy scientific curiosity—can administration be made a science? The other is the hope that by such knowledge we may improve practice. It is quite possible, even likely, that most students will be moved by both of these purposes. With either, or with a combination of the two interests, one may think of the administrative process as a major grand division of the total field of administration and then find a way to subdivide this into smaller and smaller areas for study. Only so can a proper orientation for the study of a single problem be attained.

The problem here, then, is to try to lay out this one special field for study, to break it down into smaller parts by finding its natural or functional lines of cleavage, if there be any such, by a study of which the real nature of administrative action may be revealed. We ask, at the outset, what is administration? We must have some kind of answer for this question before we can know whether we want any of it; then, if we do want it, what it could be used for and how

[21] The work of Frederick Winslow Taylor, late in the last century, was the first serious attempt to study management activities. His interest was in finding a sound basis for economy of effort employed in doing physical work. See his *Shop Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911.

it could be used. To get at the nature of the administrative process, we shall need to know it in all its aspects and parts. For this purpose the analysis below is believed to provide a comprehensive basis and to be planned in terms of such lines of study as are best adapted to a search for the real nature of the activity. We would propose five lines of study as follows:

1. The aims and purposes of administration as a function.
2. The energizing power or powers and their behavior.
3. The activity or process itself.
4. The mechanism that gives form and limits and that channels the energy.
5. The object upon which administration falls, its work with its final effects.

If we think of these as the major divisions of the field, it will be obvious that a study of any one of them would use much that would be essential in the other fields, that in subject matter they are not so separate as are two distinct geographical areas. But if the nature and meaning of administration are to be found, no one of these areas or approaches can go unexplored. Each of them points clearly toward sources that hold essential truth about the nature of the function as a whole.

Whence administration came, its origin, must be evident in its aims; it must have originated in response to the needs by which its aims were conceived. The energizing force that makes for action, that does the work, must also have been created to meet a need; and it, too, must have been purposeful and must have been controllable with reference to chosen purpose. The process itself is amazingly complex, but it originated in and has developed to fit the variety of activities required by the work. The mechanism—the most readily observable feature or aspect of administration —like the process, is what it is by virtue of the nature of the task it has had to perform. Finally, the work preformed

tells much about what administration really is, and it serves as one basis for calling the performance good or bad. To lay out a plan and to explain how to study its origin and aims, the energy that makes it active, the processes it uses in performing its work, the structure that gives it form and character, and the work done—that is, the object of its existence—is the further purpose of this chapter.

5. *Study of the Origin and Aims of the Administrative Function*

Adminstration as means, not as end. Any search into the nature of administration must try, if possible, to find out how the administrative function came to exist as a separate activity—this, on the theory that the forces that gave rise to it must have shaped its character at the outset.[22] Further, the forces that gave rise to the function must have much to do with maintaining it. If this is so, knowledge of these forces and of how they tend to make this function necessary should help toward the development of a science of administration and contribute very much toward an improvement of administrative practice.

At the start, it is necessary to consider whether administration is to be thought of primarily as a means of facilitating group effort in the performance of a task or as providing the administrators with power to control others, with positions of prestige, or with pleasant or profitable occupations.

[22] This viewpoint as an approach is well illustrated by such works as Benjamin N. Cardoza, *The Growth of the Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924; Jerome Frank, *Law and the Modern Mind.* New York: Brentano's Inc., 1931; and Roscoe Pound, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Further, the method of analysis and the starting point of reasoning by Plato, in the *Republic;* by Aristotle, in the *Politics;* by Locke, in his studies *On Civil Government;* by James Mill, in his essays on "Government," on "Jurisprudence," and on "Law of Nations"; and by John Stuart Mill, in his *On Liberty,* provide not only the methodology but much of the foundation for whatever studies may be made in the realm of how to govern men.

School administration, as commonly practiced, illustrates the former meaning of the term; bureaucratic administration at its worst, with its stress upon power and its endless use of red tape, illustrates the latter.

No argument is needed to bring about the conclusion that, whatever might appear to be true at times in the realm of government or of labor management here and there over the earth, in the realm of education, administration came in answer to the need of educators for help in working more effectively together in the performance of their tasks. This means that we are to regard administration as a means to educational ends and, accordingly, that the reasons for its existence and the measures of its worth are to be found in the degree to which it helps to bring the combined powers of the individual workers to bear upon the task of running the schools.

The factor of personality. This conclusion seems so obvious, so unavoidable, that it is easy to overlook certain factors. Where there is administration, there must be administrators. In practice it is what we actually get as administration and not what we theorize about that counts. We may adopt the above concept and agree that we will make every administrative decision and shape every action in terms of the educational need. But we forget that the administrator is a part of the total picture, that he is only human, that often he is driven by habit or by prejudice, by love of ease and harmony and authority and prestige, and by the pressure of friendships, as well as by his professional knowledge. These are facts that cannot be left out of account. They are as real and as sure to be operative as are the facts about educational purposes and facts about the need for facilitating the cooperative efforts of a group of individuals.

The factor of training. This seems to suggest that the nature of administrative work derives from the nature of the educational task, modified by the nature of the administrator. In so far as the latter is determined by training, we can make sure by careful selection that it will be effective in

handling the task; but it is partly a matter of biology and psychology; for character, personality, health, and endurance are factors that are deeply rooted in nature and that remain in some degree unknown until they are tested by trial in the work. Men who are honest, intelligent, and tactful will be guided by educational need; but dishonest, selfish, power-seeking men may ignore such needs.

From these facts about administrators it follows that administration must be of a nature to safeguard educational needs against such possible forces of evil. In other words, since the administrative function came into being in the hands of men, it must be the nature of administration both to facilitate right action and to prevent wrong action. It must cut both ways. Keeping true to right action means moving in terms of educational need. Keeping a defense against wrong action means anticipation of wrong action by erecting preventives against it, remembering that wrong action can come from administrators themselves, as well as from outside sources or from other places within the school system.

How the administrative function arises. To show how the administrative functions came into existence, we may illustrate crudely as follows: Two or three primitives go out to hunt game. All the way, they work together. They come upon tracks, hear noises, find evidence in places, that the game has rested or has been feeding; they find the game; they separate, one to chase and the others to head it off; they signal to each other, etc. In this task there is purpose, there is fact gathering, there is planning, there is directing, and there must have been decisions made and followed and a careful coordination of effort. It was a joint effort and there was management in its performance; yet, there was no one who could be called administrator. The function was there, but it was not differentiated from the total performance. It was carried on by the three, quite incidentally and with no thought of power or prestige, only with the aim of getting the work accomplished.

It is a far cry from that experience to a task that requires

hundreds or thousands for its performance. Between these extremes, somewhere along the line, as the tasks have grown larger or have required more varieties of work, the group must have chosen one of its number to give signals and to guide the men as they tried to act together. As one moves on along this line, he comes to tasks that involve complex calculations, highly technical procedures—tasks that have to be planned in minutest detail before they are executed and that require delicate and carefully timed operations for their performance. In cases where the work becomes thus highly specialized, management is concerned not only with numbers of workers and variety in materials but also with fitting types of work together.

This may not reveal perfectly the way in which the function of administration was born in the realm of government, but it is in some such manner as this that administration got separated out from total performance and became a special function. All the time, while the function was taking form, it is to be remembered that its work was being carried out by men—good men and bad men, able men and weak men. Administration and administrators thus grew up together. Now we are in the advanced stage of this development, attempting to formulate a philosophy and a science to guide it.

Finding the nature of the process by a study of the needs that give rise to it. To examine these two sets of originating forces briefly, our study would ask, "How can educational needs give rise to this function and how has the function shaped itself to achieve its chosen goals and to defeat efforts to thwart its proper purposes in favor of ends not suited to educational needs?"

The purpose of the school is to educate those who attend it. First, we, as a people, decided that education was essential in our society.[23] The reasoning by which we arrived at this decision is familiar—self-government requires intelligent

[23] Jesse B. Sears, "Our Theory of Public School Support." *School and Society*, 43:73–84, Jan. 18, 1936.

citizens. But, what is education? Here, at first, we followed tradition, in part, because we lacked knowledge; but gradually we learned that the end of education is not competency in self-government alone, but competency in all of living and being and becoming; its ends are devoted to both present and future need—need, not in the abstract but for each learner individually, in his own and his people's world.

What is the nature of education, assuming that it is to serve these ends? One cannot set up a school until he can answer this. How do we produce this education, that is, how do we learn and how do we teach (help others to learn)? Our answer has been to bring children together and teach them in groups. For this effort we must build shelters to work in, we must have something (curriculum) to be learned, we must have facilities and methods by which learners may take hold of what they are to learn. This leads us as deeply as it does quickly into the science of human nature. Learning is not merely acquiring facts about life and about our physical and social world; it is also living, developing, becoming that which it is possible, within the limits of our natures and our environments, for us to become. Thus, we need a curriculum (educational activities and experience) that will be food for personality, character, physique, aesthetic taste, and intellect, all alike. It will be necessary, therefore, to shape our housing, our equipment, our procedures, in a manner to facilitate the activities of living together, of learning—alone and together—and of teaching. As teaching must recognize need for learning and the laws by which nature makes learning possible, it follows that administration is not something imposed upon the school but something discovered through a study of these needs.

This reasoning is summed up in the following steps. Administration should exist only where it is needed to orient and coordinate and plan for the forces at work on the job. Its tasks appear in a school system only as there is evidence that it can improve the efficiency of the work. It may be

needed at the very outset, as well as later, to help plan the program of instruction; to assemble the personnel and materials; to organize the children, the staff, and the facilities for the schools; and so on in all parts of the system. But precisely what administration will have as its duties at any point will be found only after the schools have been studied and the needs have been discovered.

Can the needs for administration be learned once for all? After years of experience we have found, it is true, that needs for administration are roughly of the same types from school to school. In all systems there are personnel, finance, plant, curriculum, research, library, and laboratory problems; there are planning, organizing, directing, controlling, and coordinating problems; but, in each system, each of these is of a special nature because of the particular conditions and circumstances that give rise to it in the immediate case. Accordingly, one cannot approach the administrative handling of them with a ready-made recipe or a blueprint of action. Instead, he must approach each case as a separate problem and, by study of it, develop a procedure for its treatment.

Because, after having dealt with a problem—say, making a budget—over and over, one finds that what he did in one case works in nearly all cases, the impression grows that there is, after all, a rule to follow. So, why work it all out anew each time? In this way we have come to have so many rule-of-thumb administrators—men who are cocksure, men who do not grow but who tend more and more to use authority to solve problems that should be solved by study. We surely do learn much in one budget task that will apply in other cases. The purpose, the form, the routine of collecting estimates, the checking of estimates against possible revenue and against proposed uses of funds may be learned once for all, perhaps; but their use in a school system involves much more than this. A school budget should be a financial expression of the educational program it is to pay for. Consequently, there is the question of knowing what

the program is and how to express it in financial terms. This problem is by no means the same from one school system to another. What is true here is true in most administrative problems. There are routines, techniques, devices, procedures, and scientific methods that carry over from place to place, but these are only the tools of the job; there is the job, besides. So the doctor, here, as in medicine, must know his patient as well as he knows his instruments and drugs and nursing routines.

This too-brief analysis may serve somewhat to orient the reader throughout the chapters that follow. No separate study is devoted to a full treatment of what is so barely suggested here, nor does separate study seem necessary, inasmuch as this problem is, in fact, an aspect of each of the problems that are separately treated. By implication and often by direct analysis, constant use will be made of the principle and the viewpoint involved, and by this it is hoped that further light may be thrown upon the principle itself —the principle that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the work it performs.

6. *Study of the Nature of the Administrative Process*[24]

Mechanism, power, and process in administration. Part I of this book is devoted to a study of the nature of the administrative process. Although the process and the mechanism by which the process is carried on are in reality too much a part of each other for either to have much meaning alone; yet it is possible—often very profitable—to think of them separately, and we commonly do so. Much the same is true of the relation between the process and the power that energizes and keeps the process going on. In a sense, the administrative process is partly power, partly a mechanism of channels and stations through which the power moves to its tasks, and partly activity or the behavior of the power within the limits of its mechanism. Thus we may

[24] Leon Green, "The Administrative Process." *American Bar Association Journal,* 21:708–712, 738, November, 1935.

refer to administrative authority, administrative organization, and administrative procedure. For purposes of study, there can be advantage in separating the three, provided that we recognize the danger of destroying their true nature as parts of a single whole.

By way of introducing the study of the administrative process, a distinction may well be made between organization as a process or activity and organization as a mechanism. We speak of planning or of developing or of forming an organization, by which we mean that we are putting people or materials, or both, together in a manner to make it possible for them to work together as an institution. The process by which the arrangement was effected is called organizing.

Study of the process involves application of these three elements to the work in hand. To get at the nature of the administrative process, one must examine it from the standpoint of what it is, from that of how it behaves, and from that of what it accomplishes. Looking at the process for what it is, one sees it first of all as action, as things going on in some orderly fashion and under control. Behind, or instigating, the action, he senses force or authority of some sort. This power, being applied to persons and things and ideas, causes them to behave in certain ways, as the power dictates. People take up duties; materials become buildings, playgrounds, libraries, curriculums; ideas become aims or objectives of effort for people, plans of action, policies, or reasons for doing things.

As one looks at the process—as such—as action, he notes that it is not mechanical or automatic, but conscious and controlled. It starts or stops or changes direction at will. Its activity at one point is of the nature of thinking what to do or how to do it, that is, planning; at another, it is of the nature of coordinating, bringing things into proper relationship, to the end that there may be harmony of effort; at another, it is of the nature of control, the process seemingly turning about, as if to evaluate its own behavior. As one

looks at the work done by this process, he sees a school system as a unified enterprise, with purposes, plans, organization, program, personnel, materiel, all designed as functions or parts of a self-conscious and purposeful institution.

Although one cannot study the administrative process without continuous reference to the nature of the power it uses and reflects; and without continuous reference to the mechanism that channels its power; and without continuous reference to the work it performs, the changes it effects, the things it brings about, the people and materials through and to which it applies its power, it still is possible to examine the power and the mechanism and the work separately, as such. That is, administration is not all process. It is partly power, partly process, partly mechanism, and partly work to be done. The power would have no meaning unless it issued in activity and produced the process. The process would have no meaning if it were not applied to tasks we want performed. The mechanism could mean nothing if the power did not flow through it to the work and if it were not designed to fit the work. Without power, process, and mechanism, one could see the work to be done, perhaps, but could not think of the administrative aspect of the work as a separate task. That is, power, process, mechanism, and work to be done are the terms in which administrative thinking goes on.

Process can be further analyzed and separately studied. The idea that administration is a unified thing, not a number of separate and independent elements, must be regarded as a basic idea. If it is basic, then the nature of each of the elements is to be found, not only in the element itself, but in the relation that element bears to each of the others. Keeping this in mind, we may proceed with a closer view of that aspect of administration which we may call process, leaving the parts representing power, mechanism, and work for later consideration.

Five different kinds of activity were noted above as characteristic of the administrative process—planning, organiz-

MESTON TRAINING COLLEGE
12
371.2
MADRAS-14

ing, directing, coordinating, and controlling.[25] As will be seen, these terms are a bit more than barely descriptive of what one observes as he looks at administration at work.

Planning. Before one can make a decision or give a command in administration, he must have given thought to the problem at hand; otherwise, in many cases his act would be little better than random. The extent, the difficulty, and the importance of this prestudy must vary widely with the complexity of the situation faced. The number of matters involved, the period of time over which the plan is to govern action, the importance of the various elements concerned, and the degree of difficulty with which the plan can be made to operate are obvious considerations.

Though planning must precede performance—a budget must be planned before it can be expended—yet it often happens that one plans for only the first step of performance, then, having taken that step, proceeds to plan further or, often, to replan for the whole operation. In other words, planning is not a separate and independent function but is a phase of the larger process, administration. One could scarcely plan on any scale or for anything without some thought of how the plan may be operated—of the machinery required to put it into effect, of its relation to the working of other plans, and of what the results of its use may be. That is, planning interacts with direction, organization, coordination, and control, to produce the total function of management.

What is the nature of this planning activity? How is it related to and kept actively at work with the other phases of administration? How and by whom is it best performed? For how long a time and how broadly may one plan? Where does authority fit into planning? How does planning in management fit into planning for instruction? All

[25] Henri Fayol, "The Administrative Theory in the State." In *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. In the same volume, L. Urwick, "The Elements of Administration."

these and other questions must be a part of any intimate inquiry into the nature of the administrative process.

Organization. The organization of schools or of any branch of government is established in part by law; but before such law becomes a fact in management, it must be put to work by administration. This activity of putting such laws into effect is called organizing and, when the activity is completed, we refer to the results as an organization.

An organization is a machine for doing work. It may be composed primarily of persons; of materials; of ideas, concepts, symbols, forms, rules, principles; or, more often, of a combination of these. The machine may work automatically, or its operations may be subject to human judgment and will. Thus we organize people into faculties, schools, classes, grades, committees; we organize materials into buildings, libraries, apparatus, filing systems; we organize ideas and principles into policies, programs of studies, calendars, norms of achievement, routines of conduct, and the like.

Some organizations are designed, each for a specific service, others as catchalls for a wide variety of services. Some organizations are temporary, others are more permanent. But how permanent should any plan be? Some organizations function with and others without the use of executive authority.

It is quite easy to forget or to underrate the importance of the work that these familiar facts about school organization represent. A school system, a school program, a book of rules and regulations, a budget, a salary schedule, the floor plans of buildings, a curriculum—all these we take for granted. Yet, to design these machines, to empower them or provide for their functioning, calls for the application of all we know about the science and philosophy of education. If we are to understand and to use the term organization or the verb organize, we shall need to inquire as to the nature of this function, especially as to how it is related to other

phases of the administrative process—to planning, direction, coordination, and control.

Direction. Direction, or command, is perhaps the most obvious, and certainly the most striking aspect of the administrative process. In direction we see authority at work under control; we see action, decision, work done. To most people it is an attractive function; to most it appears easy to perform.

To see that direction is not simple and not easy to perform—in fact, very difficult to understand—one has only to consider some equally obvious matters. Besides materials and environment, there are the director and those who receive and execute directions—all human beings, most of them expertly trained and experienced, each highly responsible for an important service. The director, executive, is an official with power to decide and to command others. His authority is in the law. But what is the nature of this authority and how may the executive apply it? The director is chosen because he is believed to have ideas, tastes, expert knowledge, and skill and, with these, a personality—all of which, together, equip him to serve. He is to direct the work of highly trained people. Obviously, knowledge is going to play a part, along with authority. How may the two work together? Has each of them a separate realm? Then, to complicate matters, what is education, the service to be directed? Our schools are for the children of all the people, for society, our society; they are authorized and provided for by the state, our state; they are concerned with fitting the young to live in our society. Clearly in the use of authority and of knowledge one cannot ignore either the ends which education must serve or the nature of the educative process. Authority, knowledge, and the social forces that have made and are making our culture—these three forces, three kinds of power, are at work together; and they are being applied by, through, and to, human beings, each of whom has a personality.

This may suffice to show that direction is not simple. It

remains to be seen what light we may be able to throw upon these matters by an inquiry into the nature of the several elements as they operate in combination to produce what we call direction.

Coordination. In a school or a school system, administration is concerned with many purposes, processes, people, and things—materials, housing, business, and finances; teachers, pupils, clerks, and the public; learning, instructional objectives, equipment, methods, and programs—all in endless variety. Each of these is an element in a complex whole, a going concern, in which many kinds of talent and many forms of activity are required and in which wide reliance has to be placed upon the individual as to integrity, understanding, industry, skill, and the will to play a part. All of this is assumed as present, but there still is the task of keeping these elements together in harmony if there is to be unity of effort toward a chosen end. We call this function coordination.

By what principles or tricks may such unity be effected? May it be by force of the law or the authority vested in the executive, or by prearranged and commonly accepted plans of action? Housing must be fitted to the people and the activities it is to house; libraries must be fitted to curriculums and instructional needs; teaching and guidance, each must be performed with regard for what the other may be doing; supervision and curriculum work and research are but three phases of the effort to facilitate teaching and learning; the budget is but a financial expression of the proposed instructional program.

Not only does part have to be kept attuned to part, but purpose to purpose and process to process, as well. Schools are not mere machines that can be started and left to run. They are alive, sensitive, conscious, and self-directing, even though they are created and directed by authority from without. Law, finance, physical environment compel from without; but intelligence, taste, moral standards, professional ethics in no small way determine with what effect

these outward compulsions shall apply. Also, it is man *and* machine, not one or the other.

About this function of coordination many questions pose themselves for study. What purposes, what things, what processes, must we keep together in an educational enterprise? By what kind of power may unity be effected from case to case? When is coordination to be effected in terms of time of performance, or purpose served, or method used, or product turned out? How is coordinating different from and related to other elements in the administrative process? These questions mark the line of inquiry that we shall need to follow.

Control. In administration, control is an obvious necessity. One cannot direct action without control of the forces energizing the action, or without control of the persons and things directed or of the ends to be achieved. A budget would have little value if it did not control expenditures, and an order would be meaningless if its recipients might obey or not at will.

Control can be direct or indirect. It is direct when effected through continuous personal supervision or by some mechanical device; it is indirect when prescription of procedure is followed by a system of checks providing an appraisal of results. Control can be by physical force; or by laws, policies, regulations, and instructions; or by plans, drawings, charts, and forms; and often by such social forces as traditions, customs, manners, moral standards, and professional ethics. In many of these, rewards and penalties can be used, if necessary, to strengthen the controls.

Control must be applied to objectives, or ends to be served; to processes by which work goes on; to environment and materials used; and to the people who do the work. Otherwise, there could be no hope of harmonious action.

Here, too, as in the cases of the other elements of the administrative process, it is plain that we are dealing with but part of a larger whole and not with a separate and independent function. With such a wide variety of needs for

control; with several kinds of energy to apply—law, knowledge, social norms; with the possibility of applying control at the outset, during action, or at the conclusion of work; with endless numbers of control devices available for use, we shall need to search with care if we are to understand the nature of this phase of the administrative process and to realize how this phase is related to planning, organizing, directing and coordinating, to produce a unified and harmonious whole in management.

Personality. The administrative process is greatly affected by the personality of the administrator. Men of character and high purpose and great ability behave differently from those of the opposite caliber. This is one reason why a scientific treatment of administration is so difficult. It seems wiser, however, not to confuse the two. We need to study administrators, but such studies would be no proper substitute for a study of the processes of administration, for the reason that the process is to be shaped in terms of the work to be done and not merely in terms of the worker. If it were the other way around, then anything like a science of administration would be a lost hope.

Chapter 2. PLANNING AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

In this chapter attention is focused upon the one aspect of the administrative process called planning. What it is, what gives rise to it, why it must be a part of management, where it is to be found in practice, how it is related to other phases of the total administrative process, what it consists of, what types of situations it has to meet, who should do the planning, and how the planning service can best be directed —all are considered.

As in Chap. 1 and throughout the book, the method is that of analysis and reasoning. Planning is assumed to have a reason for existence, but the reason itself has first to be examined as a part of the search for the nature of planning.

The need for planning is found in the complexity and the importance of the school service. This complexity is examined here, as it is over and over throughout the book, for its bearing upon administrative action. Setting the conditions for individual learning—for learning that equips a child in terms of and for our culture, our form of state and society; for learning that recognizes social change; for learning that goes on in ways apace with scientific progress and yet in terms of special local needs and limitations—cannot be simple. In this review the relation of planning to all other forms of school activity is seen to be both intimate and intricate.

Following a survey of the types of situations for which planning has to be done, a study of the process itself is undertaken. Incident to consideration of how the need for

planning arises in different parts of a school system, of the problem of clarifying and defining the purpose, of the process of formulating a plan, of the means of checking plans against the prospective task of executing them, many practical questions are raised. Who should do the planning in any given case and why? When should long-term planning take precedence? What do we mean by democracy in planning? What is the place of authority in planning? When might planning be done by committees? Analysis of these and other matters bring to light suggestions as to working routines and principles of procedure through which the real nature of the planning function is revealed.

1. Definition of the Planning Function

Meaning of the term in administration. Some explanation of the term planning was given above in the first step of our analysis, wherein the administrative process was broken down into five distinctive types of activity. There the five separate phases—planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling—were briefly explained, partly as a means of showing the complexity of administration and partly by way of introducing the five succeeding chapters, to be devoted to a study of these five forms of administrative activity.

The term planning takes on no very specialized meaning as it is used here to define this one particular phase or type of administrative activity. To plan in administration means, simply, to get ready to decide or to act upon some problem or piece of work. The difficulty of planning in administration lies less in the meaning of the term, therefore, than in knowing when, where, and how to perform the function.[1]

Planning a means, not an end. Though planning can and

[1] Henri Fayol, "The Administrative Theory in the State." In *Papers on Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

often must be carried on as a separate function, it is never in itself a final end, but always a means to an end. As such, it becomes a first step in something beyond itself. This something may be further planning; but ultimately the planning is completed and its product is ready for use. The use of planning is to discover and prepare the way for some needed decision or some action to be taken. Using the word as a noun, we speak of a plan of organization, a plan of action, a plan for coordination, or a plan of control. That is, planning is an aspect of any administrative activity in which the situation is too involved to be disposed of offhand.

Besides acceptance of the thought of planning as a making ready for action and as a preliminary phase of other forms of administrative activity, note may be taken here of the fact that planning is primarily an intellectual activity, for it is likely to involve a study and use of facts and, often, of principles. Usually it will require knowledge, imagination, and reasoning, and often, a mastery of the special skills and techniques of research.[2] Finally, planning is always done for some specific purpose or end.

This partial explanation of the term and of the activity of planning may serve to guide the initial steps of our inquiry into the nature of planning as one of the elements of the administrative process. Only by a complete analysis of the activity itself can our definition be made to reveal the full meaning of the function as it must come to be understood and used in school administration.

2. *Need for Planning in Administrative Work*

Origin of the planning function. Above note was taken of how the function of administration came into existence.

[2] J. R. Howard Roberts, "The Professional Expert and Administrative Control." *Public Administration,* 7:247–251, July, 1929. See also Alfred C. Neal, "The Planning Approach in Public Economy." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 54:246–254, February, 1940; and John M. Pfiffner, *Research Methods in Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940.

Here we may pursue this same inquiry further by considering how the planning aspect of administration must have arisen.

Administration in education, as in government or business, is concerned with getting work done. School work itself is complex in many ways, and doubly so because, for the individual as well as for society or for state, it extends through long periods of time and is subject to change as time passes. In the administration of schools, one must think not only of things as they are, but also of things as they are to become—that is, of things present and of things not present. Accordingly, the administrator may have tangible people, materials, and programs before him to work with or he may have only facts, ideas, and theories. In either case, he is constantly shifting his thoughts from present to future, from what now is to what ought to be or what he desires to bring about.

If, as is elsewhere noted, the administrative function derives its nature mainly from the nature of the services it directs, then the needs for and, so, the origin of the planning function must be found by a study of that service, as well as of the task of shaping and directing its own performance. That is, the principle that applies to the whole must apply to the part, as well—the nature of any administrative activity derives from the nature of the service it renders, modified only by surrounding circumstances and the capacity of man to act in the case. It is in terms of this principle that our attempt is to be made to find an explanation of the nature of the administrative process.

The nature of school law makes planning necessary. The need for planning must vary with the complexity of the work in hand, but in any case, if the principle just stated is to be tested out by applying it to practice, we shall have constantly to keep before us, also, a clear picture of the service of education in all its forms and aspects and stages and a clear picture of the forces and circumstances that circumscribe or give rise to educational activities. That is,

if the nature of school work dictates how one may or must direct its performance in general, then it must also dictate as to what kind of planning is needed and when and where, in order to direct its performance.

The function of public school administration starts only after legislation has established schools to administer. The laws by which the schools are created are, in fact, the starting point for their administration. In many respects these laws are very specific and detailed, indicating precisely what action is to be taken. In other respects they are very general, leaving to those in charge wide freedom to judge and decide what action shall be taken. When the law prescribes in detail and leaves no alternative, there can be little need for planning, but to put general laws into effect one is compelled to decide what the law intends and how it may be put into effect in the circumstances.

The reason for general laws is that, in many cases, specific laws are impossible to write or would be impractical because it could not be known in advance just what action might be required. The needs of one district might be almost the opposite of those in another. The needs of a district or a school in one year might be quite unlike the needs there, a year later.

The object of general law is not to provide license to do just anything, but rather, to provide opportunity to bring science to bear in the solution of problems the nature of which can be understood only when one has the facts and circumstances before him. General laws have authority behind them, but it is the intent that that authority shall be held in abeyance until science and philosophy have been applied, and that its application shall be to give effect to what the study of the case has concluded. The more general the statute, the wider the opportunity for science and the greater the obligation of authority to restrain itself until science has spoken.[3]

[3] Here is a tangible point upon which the ethics of the profession might well undertake to define responsible conduct.

Since so much of school law is general, and since the matters to which these laws pertain are so widely varied in character and complexity from place to place and from time to time, it follows that the work of planning—the service to be performed by science—must range from virtually nothing in some cases to exhaustive studies in others.

The factors of human nature and social change make planning necessary. Our ideas of education, as well as our ideas of school law are based in part upon the democratic concept of society. No one (of our culture) questions this philosophy, but very few understand it well enough to realize that its application involves the practice of compromise. A child grows up in its ways and, by that fact, comes to accept and believe in it. In a sense, he inherits it and seldom thinks to reason it out.

It should be the purpose of education in our society to put this inheritance upon the soundest basis possible. If democracy seeks to make free men, then instead of accepting our way of life blindly, our children should be helped to understand the principles upon which it rests. Why do we prize the personal virtues that we do? Why do we let all the people have a part in government? Why do we guarantee free speech, the right to worship as we choose, etc.? The schools we administer must be concerned as to whether we are developing in our children the power to practice democracy alone, and also, the power to keep it alive.[4] It is one thing to hand our children a ready-made concept of life and a different thing to equip them to formulate and to decide upon a good way of their own.

One aspect of this problem, one that will be a concern throughout this book, may well be examined briefly at this point. It has to do with what at times seems to be a conflict between two opposing forces and, so, between two con-

[4] See Arthur Twining Hadley, "Democracy in Theory and Practice." *The Relations between Freedom and Responsibility in the Evolution of Democratic Government.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921.

flicting purposes of education. On the one hand we seek social stability, social solidarity, permanence, security, a fixed mode of life. On the other, we struggle toward a better life, seeking for change, for growth, for progress. In each individual life, in every institution, in society as a whole, this conflict is inevitable. Life is like that. We are, by our own biological and psychological natures and by the fact of continuous change in the world about us, parties in this battle between status quo and progress. To train men to fight intelligently as well as valiantly in it, must be the aim of our schools.

This fact about our natures and our society is significant for planning. Back of our system of social proprieties, our conventions and customs, our beliefs and legends, our modes of speech and our laws, are our common wills, interests, ideals, aspirations, fears, and capacities to do things. Working together, this complex of social forces gives order and form to our modes of life together. This social order has grown up slowly and is stable and durable because of the trials through which its many elements have evolved. Its holding power—power to remain constant—is seen when one considers how murder, pillage, cheating, and pronounced immorality are resented by the public. It is seen, also, when proposals are made for a better plan of education involving abandonment of the old school home, or when a new dance step begins to replace the old. Ways of life become parts of our personalities, as it were; so the reason why older people often resent social change, while young people seem often to welcome it, is because these ways of life are less a part of self with the young than with the old. The discomfort or even the danger of a change here or there may be felt keenly by the old and for ample reason and yet be casually ignored by those who, by age, could have no basis for understanding or appreciating it.[5]

[5] This conflict of need for security and for certainty, in a world where, by our own natures, we tend to produce continuous change in the world about us and to set new problems for ourselves, must

Social stability in a society of free men is an achievement of great value; it is a work of art and a source of enjoyment for all who are truly members in it. Social stability is the greatest single guarantee of such a society against enemies, be they germs, economies, ideologies, beasts, or men, attacking from within or without. Membership in a stable society gives one a sense of security that is basic to all else and without which one is little likely to live a free life and contribute positively his own best to the well-being of himself and his society. It would be trite, therefore, but not the less important, to say that training for social stability is a major concern of our kind of education.

For education to give attention to this purpose to conserve the treasured elements of our culture, and by this to assist in maintaining social stability, would mean that the schools should teach our pattern of culture to the young. For this purpose the subject matter required would be chosen from those elements of the culture most treasured; but here one gets into the question of social and intellectual values, which is the concern of the teaching experts, not alone of the administrator and, so, not especially of this study. The administrator knows that this end—social stability—must be served by conserving chosen cultural values and forms and his concern is to see that it is planned for.

On the other hand, our seemingly natural distaste for change in our modes of life appears, in a way, to be at odds with our own natural tendency to inquisitiveness. Life is so much, so constantly, and so importantly a matter of learning; infants, youths, and adults alike, are so uniformly inquisitive, so uniformly delighted by their own discoveries, that

---

ever plague us. Hence, the necessity for regarding this problem of change and adjustment, both for each individual and for every institution, every purpose and process of society, as ever present. See Jerome Frank, *Law and the Modern Mind.* New York: Brentano's Inc., 1931; also Frederick R. Coudert, *Certainty and Justice.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1914; and Roscoe Pound, *Administrative Law; Its Growth, Procedures and Significance.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1942.

one wonders at their growing conservatism as age and experience accumulate. This seeming inconsistency is less surprising, however, when one thinks of the nature and place of habit, of the ever-present and desperately urgent demand for security, of how much our more routine ways of life become parts of ourselves, and of how largely these accumulated attitudes and habits and personality traits determine our preferences in our way of living.

Evidence of this resistance to change can be seen in positive form in our seemingly innate struggle to have permanency in all things about us. To have fixed laws,[6] fixed modes of business, fixed religions, fixed moral and social standards, fixed speech, fixed manners—these are the constant hope and effort of all, the demand for them varying only in degree with age. Yet man's own inquiring mind is also a fact, and our concept of social progress represents a deeply felt purpose of our people—so deep, in fact, that it seems to be an essential element in our concept of democracy. To wish to have a better way of life for our children is an outstanding characteristic of most of us. This attitude may have its roots in our early struggle upward to freedom from a form of bondage, but it certainly rests, as well, upon the belief that there is a more enlightened form of freedom yet to be attained for the individual and for his society.

Discovery and invention provide outlet for this desire for progress, even compel us to accept it. Planning for social progress is clearly an obligation of the school; therefore, not only because our nature cannot be satisfied without it, but also, because the changes that are going on cannot possibly be ignored. Furthermore, such changes are numerous and appear in or otherwise affect all aspects and compartments of life; they are not of equal value—some are good and some are bad, some affect us but casually, while others may even

[6] Benjamin N. Cardozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921. See also Donald R. Richberg, "Developing Ethics and Resistant Law." *Yale Law Journal,* 32:109–122, December, 1922.

affect our most basic concept of life or of the good society we are trying to become. Whether we think of these two viewpoints as personality traits or as attitudes and habits, or as the pressure of a changing physical and social environment, it is clear that they are going to influence planning activity and the ends planned for, besides.

Scientific development in education must be reflected in administration. Another reason for the planning function lies in the fact that education itself, in all its parts and processes, is constantly being changed as a result of scientific and philosophical studies within the field.[7] The objective study of education is quite young, most of the scientific work in the field having been done within the past half century; and the philosophical work, referring now to the more specific philosophy of education for a democratic state as we now understand it, is little older. Developments in both these areas are going on rapidly and practice in the schools in most places is not apace with latest findings.

To see this type of need for planning one has only to consider the present status of scientific work in the realm of personality psychology and, with it, present practice in the fields of pupil personnel work, health care, and teaching methodology. In all these areas of practice there are important psychological findings that are not being applied. To apply them really means to revise the educational objectives, to revise the processes and machinery of guidance and health work, to effect better coordination between counseling and management, between counseling and the health work, and between counseling and classroom work. Although this is an administrative responsibility at the outset, much of the actual planning and change may be effected by teachers, counselors, nurses, doctors, and attendance officers.

The nature of education makes planning necessary. If our principle is to hold, then to administer public education,

[7] C. Reinold Noyes, "The Law and Scientific Method." *Political Science Quarterly,* 55:496–521, December, 1940.

one must know education, as well as the laws and the principle of social change. In fact, it is necessary to know education in order to understand and apply the laws and the principle of change. The law empowers the board of education to make rules for the government of the schools. It does not say what the rules are to cover, but only that they must be consistent with the law, be necessary extensions or interpretations of it, and be reasonable.

Since rules that govern the schools, of necessity, would pertain to organization—that is, to the placement and use of authority, to the fixing of rights and duties, to the definition of purposes and procedures, to the formulation of programs and policies and standards—the board would have to know or to be guided by those who know education. The working of the laws that govern the processes of learning and teaching, of supervision and guidance, of child care and development, of social change, must be facilitated by rules and not thwarted by them. This can be achieved only if the rules are written by one who can bring all this intimate knowledge of the educative process to bear in forming the rules.

At the very outset of the administrative function in education, there are the words public and education to be taken note of. Our schools, being created by the state, must be of the essence of the state, must function in support of the purpose of the state. To do this they must understand the philosophy of our democracy and be able to use it as a point of departure, as a guide, and as a motivating force in shaping the purposes, the program, the government, and the daily regimen of life and work in the schools. Here we have basic philosophical, social, and political principles that are back of the school laws and now must be put back of the laws of learning, teaching, and management.

This philosophy must be kept in mind as we formulate the objectives of the schools, as we choose materials and construct curriculums through which to attain the objectives; it must guide us in shaping the health programs and the

social programs of the schools; it must be applied in the development of libraries and in furnishing and decorating the rooms and playgrounds; it must be the basis upon which the relations of school to home and community life are worked out.

To develop a course or a curriculum for a child is to plan for activities—intellectual, physical, social—that will lead the child to understanding and appreciation of the democratic philosophy of life and to skill in its use in his relation to his government, to his community, to his school and his home. This means that one must look ahead through a period of some years, making choice in advance of materials to use, of things to be learned, of habits and skills to be acquired, of ways to live and work in the school.

While one may think of these philosophies of life as forces from the outside that somehow must come in to guide the child's life as he learns and, in a large way, that must determine what he learns, yet, that is not the whole story. However foreign these abstract concepts may be, as such, to children they are not foreign in the concrete, for the child was born and has been reared, so far, by them. He practices them—often crudely, perhaps—in his home, with his pets, and with his playmates at school and on the street. He really knows no other way of life; and as for philosophies, he has at most a few attitudes and beliefs, only the faintest beginning of a philosophy, which he is to spend his life in developing. But this is precisely the point. These concepts have to be used, not as abstractions, but as modes of living and learning, as ways of examining and judging and deciding. In the mind of the administrator, they exist as viewpoint, as standards, as values; but in planning school work he must use them only as guides. To the child they must be ways of living, working, playing; they must be things to study, things to examine, immediate goals to attain, not mere adult abstractions.

It seems obvious that these philosophies cannot be brought to bear properly in management without serious thought, without planning. But our reasoning must go a

step further. Democracy respects the individual. Its aim is to free the individual to live, and to train him to respect the rights of others to live equally free. To do this, it proposes the principle of justice and fair dealing and the principle of truth and fact as the basis of conduct. To apply these principles, one must be able to find truth and fact, to judge what is fair and just. To develop this capacity in all our children must be a major purpose of our public schools.

How may this kind of learning be achieved? The school executive must devise a program of study, he must arrange housing and work facilities, he must employ teachers. This brings him to consider the question of how children learn. A program of instruction must be thought of as including all that a child reacts to from the time he arrives until he leaves school. It includes study time, play time, recitation time; it includes contacts with people, ideas, physical surroundings; it includes reactions that are mental, physical, and emotional. How do children learn to distinguish facts from fancy? How do they learn to judge right from wrong or the beautiful from the ugly? How do they develop self-control, the ability to lead or follow or cooperate, a love for decency, a pride in their community? Clearly, one cannot devise a program of instruction without knowing the laws of learning, nor could he choose and assign teachers for the program without knowing the laws of teaching.

One could not so much as start a school without thinking of and without applying all these ideas. Administration must look ahead; it must be guided by the science and the philosophy that brought the schools into existence and developed them; it must move in terms of the laws by which human nature has come to be what it is and by which children live, develop, and learn. The act of bringing knowledge of all these matters to bear is the act of planning.

The nature of administration itself makes planning necessary.[8] The whole of this book is concerned with the com-

[8] See Leonard D. White, *Trends in Public Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933.

plexities of the administrative process. Accordingly, only a sample of evidence on this topic can be given here. However well one may know our political purposes regarding schools, the social philosophy upon which our society and our schools are founded, the nature of our world, and the laws of learning and teaching, he still would have much to learn before he could direct the operations of a school system.

To see how true this is, one has only to consider what is most obvious about administration. It must move with reference to the future, as well as the present; and it cannot ignore the past. It must deal with finance, with a wide variety of properties, and with people—all in terms of educational objectives, social purposes, economic capacities, and the aspirations and capacities of individuals. How to organize schools, how to house them, how to obtain funds, how to direct operations, how to practice sound economy, how to select and organize the staff required, how to furnish and equip the schools, how to develop libraries, curriculums, cafeterias, laboratories, playgrounds, and art rooms, suggest what a variety of tasks the administrator must face.

No one of these tasks is simple in itself. One does not get a strong faculty by wishing for it. He must know what abilities to select, must have an efficient method of attracting such talent, must be able to arrange their work in a manner that pleases them, and must know how to stimulate their growth in the service. He must know how to develop and maintain a high morale in the staff. Along with this, he must know how to get rid of misfits. Yet, use of the purge is dangerous; one cannot develop morale merely by command or threat. There must be a *positive* approach. Some try to achieve it by backslapping or by a form of political maneuvering, but the results are never professionally dependable. To be sound, morale in education must center in the aims, the program, and the processes of education.

To pursue this one problem further, take the matter of attracting and holding a staff. This is a question of com-

pensation. With what can one compensate teachers? Money, tenure, promotion, suitable program of work—that is, suitable professional opportunity, retirement allowance, sabbatical- and sick-leave provisions, opportunity for recreation and study—suggest possible means. What are the best ways of using these means, separately or together, in a school system? In determining this, endless questions arise, differently in different systems. The supply-and-demand approach must be understood; the question of initial salary, the question of the number of annual salary increases to provide for, the proper recognition of experience and of training, and the question of rewarding for high efficiency suggest some of the important angles to this question of money compensation. When the other forms of reward are combined with the salary plan, the task is even more complicated.

To say that such matters could be handled without careful planning, planning that looked ahead through years of time, that was designed to meet the educational needs of the community, that took account of the ability of the people to pay for schools, and that, in doing these things, faced such specific matters as those just mentioned, would be naïve indeed.

This type of situation is faced in all fields of administrative work. Organization for a school, a school system, a college, a university, must be a long-term problem. Buildings must serve several generations, so the builder must try to anticipate changes that are likely to come in the populations and the programs that are to be housed. Record systems must be continuous if they are to be useful. Guidance will not function effectively with instruction, with library service, with home and community interests, with record systems, with health service, unless there is a plan for coordinating them.

This rather extended analysis is offered here less to convince the reader that the function of planning is necessary than to provide a general survey as the first step in a study

of this aspect of school administration. Only when one looks carefully into the nature of the administrator's job can he be impressed with the idea that administration cannot act without planning, unless it is willing to depend upon guessing or upon authority or upon accident or luck to do what should be done only in the light of facts and principles. Our system of government, our way of life as a people, our methods of teaching and learning, our program of education, and our system of school administration must be built together—must be built in terms of the facts and principles of life that underlie them all alike.

3. *Classification of Planning Needs*

Emergency planning. We might distinguish between emergency planning and planning for an expected or a purposed program of work. It is clearly the object of management everywhere to anticipate needs and, in advance, to have ready a way to meet situations as they arise. In spite of our effort to do this, the daily papers frequently report serious happenings that management had not foreseen or forestalled. Although after a disaster has come it often is possible to see how the trouble might have been anticipated and prevented, yet there are many cases that cannot be foreseen at all, to say nothing of their being timed. Just how impossible is it to foresee and to be ready for such sudden upsets, the effects of which range from momentary inconveniences to serious property damage, personal injuries, or even loss of life?

In this connection, without being too literal, it is well to remind oneself that there is never anything new in the world. About everything has happened at least once, in at least one form. Most emergencies are associated with fires, storms, explosions, electric currents, or with defective or inadequate building or apparatus or furniture; and more could be added to this list. Many serious happenings could be classified as to the form they take, as to where they take place, as to when they occur, and as to the effects they

produce. Quite as important is the question of frequency; that is, the probability that there will be a fire; that it will be when school is in session; that it will be well advanced before discovered; that the one who discovers it will fail to give the alarm; that it will be in a two-story building; that fire escapes will have to be used; that doors, windows, and fire escapes will operate perfectly; that teachers and pupils will perform effectively. One can think of possibilities in all these situations, in the light of experience and, sometimes, in the light of statistics, if only he will take pains to look for facts.

Knowledge of probability in such matters would tell us what we could count on as happening. Children who have never been on a fire escape may make difficulties; those who have used them are likely to do better. It should be possible to know for a reasonable certainty how the children and teachers would perform. So it is that we have at least some chance to foresee most of the sudden dangers that may arise and, to that extent, have a basis for getting ready in advance to meet, if we cannot forestall, them.

The fire drill is a plan for meeting the sudden coming of a fire or storm or explosion that might render the building unsafe. A board regulation requiring the principal to check regularly all banisters; door locks; fire escapes; play apparatus; gas, electric, and water outlets; and fire hose is a part of the plan to prevent accidents. The system of health inspection is a plan to forestall the outbreak of infectious or contagious diseases.

The question is how far can administration go in its study of the probability of emergency situations? In so far as it can establish the probability of a thing's happening, to that extent it has a chance to think ahead, first, of preventing the happening or, if that seems impossible, of being ready to deal with its results.

Regular planning—positive. We are apt to think of emergency planning as a relatively small part of an administrator's responsibilities and of the positive phase of his work

as by far the more important. The above illustrations are meant to show, not only that we must expect emergencies to arise and that we must try to anticipate them, but that the emergency planning is not entirely separate from, but interlocks closely with, planning for the regular work of schools. Preventing accidents and the spread of disease is but a part of the health, safety and physical-education program.

This is to suggest that emergency planning is but a phase of the regular planning that is done for the school program as a complex, on-going enterprise. Schools are not established for us, they do not run automatically. Their purposes must be formed in light of the needs of the children, the parents, the community, the state, and the nation; they must be organized in a manner that will look to the proper care, comfort, and development of the children as they work at their programs of learning and in a manner that is suited to the aspirations and economic capacity of the people of the community. What kind of schools to establish, how many, where located, with what types of housing and facilities and curriculums, with how large and what kind of staff, with what funds, by what contracts—these problems are to be determined, not separately, each on its own merits, but together, in light of purposes formed as here suggested. Further, the schools are to run on and on. People will come and go; endless changes will take place affecting the need for schools; but schools must go on as long as there are children to be educated.

Getting ready to meet these many problems we may think of as the program of positive planning. We plan the layout of the school system or, if it is already established, we plan to keep it adjusted to changing needs. We plan the program, the new buildings, the budget, the salary schedule, the introduction of cafeterias, guidance, curriculum-revision work, a research program; or we replan them continuously. One can think of replanning as the means of keeping our plans abreast of change. In our country there are few schools or school systems that have not changed in size and

in character of population to an extent that has forced us to act anew upon the housing, the curriculum, the staff, the budget, and the equipment of the school. And for all education, scientific developments—either directly or as the result of social changes—have compelled us to replan almost every feature of our school system.

Parts of this positive planning may be thought of as long-term and other parts as short-term planning. The layout of a school system and the building program represent long-term plans. In its major aspects, the curriculum is a long-term plan. The library card catalogue is a long-term plan. The budget is long-term, in part, and short-term, in part. Plans for registration, for examinations, for interschool games, for a staff meeting, are short-term plans.

Regular planning—negative. As there are things to be done, there are also things to be prevented in managing schools. A special case of the latter is the accident that comes suddenly, with little or no warning, and that presents emergency needs. Somewhat parallel to these there are other interfering forces that appear less suddenly, with less display of force, perhaps, but that may be quite as damaging to education. Reference is to individuals and groups who come to the schools, often with a pretense of wishing to serve them but, in fact, with the intention of using the schools to advance some interests of their own.

The distribution of advertising to school children, announcing things for outsiders, allowing people to make talks, permitting outsiders to influence choice of appointees, may be means of rendering useful service. But when useless or damaging nostrums are given to children by advertisers, when unworthy interests are presented in plausible phrases by speakers, when someone outside the schools decides who shall teach or counsel children, or who shall care for the school plant, there is the possibility—a fair probability—that, unless great care is used, educational purposes and programs may be ignored in favor of lending respectability to unworthy causes.

Many of these are well-intentioned but ignorant or misguided forces; many are clever, ruthless, and indifferent to the proper interests of the schools. School personnel are generally regarded as persons of intelligence and character. The schools have high social standing. Whatever is said or done by school people as a part of the school program, thereby gains the label of respectability. Knowing this, evil forces will use every means available to tag their own activities with the school label.

Such interests often enter the school openly, hoping to gain their ends by sales talks; often, however, they begin further back, by electing a board member upon whom they can depend to promote their interests later. This same game is sometimes played in teachers' organizations; and it is played even in legislatures, where school laws are made. Though the device itself is not new, various new forms of it have appeared in recent years, such as trying to promote un-American ideologies under the guise of a so-called progressive social-studies program. Even though these efforts tend to defeat themselves, as this one has done, they cause a great amount of harm, which careful planning might often have forestalled.

4. *The Nature of the Planning Process*

Different approaches to the study of the planning process. What of the process itself?[9] By the definition of planning as set forth at the beginning of this chapter, by the analysis of the needs out of which administrative planning must inevitably arise, and by classification of the types of planning required in managing schools, some light has been thrown already upon the nature of the planning activity. It remains to scrutinize the process itself—if possible, first, to break it down in a manner to reveal what forms of activity are involved and what kinds of energy are consumed

[9] There is an extensive literature on the nature and function of research in administration of government, industry, and education, alike. Consult the bibliography.

by it; and second, after having determined the composition of the activity, to consider how the activity may be set going, how it may be directed, and how it may be controlled. This latter inquiry assumes that the nature of the planning process is revealed as much by how we can use it, that is, by its behavior in actual administration, as it is by the nature of its constituent elements.

There are several stages in the planning process. The activity of planning has a beginning, it runs on through a period of time, and it comes to an end. To understand it, one would necessarily consider whether it is entirely alike at all stages. In a parallel way, planning starts with respect to some situation, it considers how the situation should or must be met, and it arranges a set of conditions or a series of acts to meet the need. At the beginning, there was sensing or discovery of a situation that required attention, next there was study of the situation, then came consideration of different ways to meet it, and finally a choice of ways, followed at the end by a prescription for procedure.

Here, then, are three approaches to our study of the planning process, three ways of examining it. Figuratively, we may think of the process as three-dimensional: one, in respect to the factor of time; one, in respect to the situation (the problem, work, job, disturbance, need) in which the planning is to be used; and one, in respect to the kind of activity used in planning. Although time, job, and getting ready to act are, in themselves, separate, they are closely joined together in the planning process. Time itself does not change, except in the sense of passing along. But time provides a base against which we may refer to the problem (the work being planned for) and to the activity, at different stages of their development. It will be seen that the problem is different at different stages and that this is true in part, at least, of the process of planning. In any case, as we analyze the process, we shall need to keep in mind the elements of *time* and *job* and *form of activity*, and likewise the different stages of all three of our factors, remem-

bering always that we plan for something and that it takes time to plan. As the process goes on, the job gets done; and as the job gets done, the process of doing it keeps changing.

Initiating the process. We may leave for later consideration all questions concerning who is to do the planning—whether it is to be done by individuals or committees, whether by teachers, executives, board, or research department—and all questions of what, when, and where planning shall be used; and we may focus our attention upon the process as it goes on.

Since planning is always planning for, there must be some purpose or end to be served before the planning activity can start. Planning may start from a very general purpose or from a very concrete and specific one. Upon accepting a superintendency, the new appointee may say to himself, I am going to determine as accurately as possible how efficient the schools are in comparison to what it should be possible to make them over a period of five to ten years. That presents a very broad problem, but a definite one, for it calls for an evaluation of everything in the system. Purposes, programs, organization, staff, plant, finance, business, operating procedures, and product must be studied at length over against the educational needs of the district and the capacity of the people to pay for education. It is quite possible to plan for such a comprehensive study.[10]

In such a task there would be numbers of specific tasks to deal with. The size of classes must be known in a survey study of this kind. Costs must be analyzed, plant capacity must be known, size of staff and hundreds of even more special questions suggest where detailed planning must be done as parts of the general plan.

Just what provoked the determination to plan in this case may not be entirely obvious. The new superintendent may

[10] See the report of any of the comprehensive school surveys for illustration, or see the author's *The School Survey*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925.

have noted or heard of evidence of inefficiency in the system. He may have been elected by a bare majority vote and have wanted to establish a clear record of what he started with in the position. He may have been vain and thought he could popularize himself by showing how the schools needed improvement. Undoubtedly, the character and personality of the planner was a factor in deciding to plan at all and in deciding what to plan for.

The planner, the person in charge, is clearly one important element in the process. He alone can initiate it and give it direction, regardless of whether he or others do the planning. If we ask, "Who is this person?" the answer is "Anyone in the system who has authority to plan or who has a job in which planning is necessary." Since each employee has authority to do some work, then each must have authority and responsibility to plan with respect to the work in question. But above all employees there is the school law that sets limits. All employees must accept the board's interpretation of their responsibilities under the law. The superintendent directs the execution of the laws and board decisions. Under the chief executive are lesser executives, teachers, clerks, and helpers. Put together, this group forms a hierarchy of authority. If we look at what all these people do, we note at once that their work is assigned in a manner that calls for specialization in knowledge and skills. Each has the authority and is assumed to have the special knowledge and skill required by his job, and he is expected to use both the authority and the knowledge as they are needed.

It is difficult in any case to say whether knowledge and authority are going to be rightly used by an employee, or whether personal likes, prejudices, idiosyncrasies, habits, or hates, may play too great a part. All administration is finally in the hands of persons, however much those persons may be hedged about by law, by facts, by public opinion, or by ethical standards. This must be as true for planning as for directing or organizing.

We may conclude, then, that, in initiating the planning process, there must be authority, there must be knowledge, and there must be and surely will be personality and social force.[11] In these we have the power that is required to energize the process. These powers are but potential, however, until they are stimulated to act. The authority of law moves to action only when the person in official position releases and guides it. Intelligence is alive and can go in search of things to do. Intelligence is always in the presence of stimuli and, to an extent, can choose what stimuli it will respond to and in what way it will respond. Let us apply this in a specific case. The executive has power to plan; he has a job, a responsibility, to plan for; he has knowledge to apply. He may be stimulated by various motives (personal tastes, social pressures) to start planning. He may want to know his job, as in the case above; he may have been advised by his board or his staff or the public that planning is needed; long-standing difficulties may have come to him for decision; a sudden disaster may have left several hundred children without a school building.

This reveals how planning may be initiated by the executive at will or may be thrust upon him by outside forces that he cannot ignore. Some executives are alert and aggressive, always at work, looking for weaknesses and strong points, looking for ways to improve the schools or to keep out intruding forces that harm the schools. Other executives seem to follow the rule of making as few changes or innovations as possible. Why disturb things, they ask, when they are going along with no complaints? Let sleeping dogs lie, they argue.

Clearly, this personal element, the will to act, is an important determiner and a most difficult one to predict. It

[11] A major concern of this study is to find how to use and, at the same time, how to control the personal element in administration. Man is very much in and of the culture in which he has been reared, and he acts in terms of cultural, as he does of biological or legal or scientific, authority.

is difficult because man can be moved to action by so many different things. If the needs of the job alone could dictate that the executive would act, and if the nature of those needs alone could determine when and how he would act—that is, if the executive would apply his knowledge and his authority to the task in terms of his real responsibilities and never in terms of his fears or prejudices or whims or selfish ambitions—then the factors would all be controllable. Since this personal element cannot be ruled out, we must accept it and try to keep it as true to its proper obligations as we can. Good laws, good regulations, good policies, good organization, good training, good job assignments, good work conditions will have this unpredictable, personal element in mind and will do all they can to make its proper functioning possible and attractive and its improper functioning difficult and unattractive.

Formulating objectives in planning. Sensing a need for planning in one's work, and readying one's authority and knowledge for use, are but the alerting stage of action. The sensing of need must become clear, the need defined, before one can decide what, if any, planning to do. It is one thing to have a vague idea that the curriculum is weak, quite a different thing to decide to do something about it. After a fire, the need for a new plant may be obvious; but the steps to take in developing plans for one would be less obvious, as analysis may show.

Consider this case of the building. The need for action is obvious. Housing for a school must be found. It is a certain school with so many children. To care for this need is possible by law, or even compulsory. This is obvious and would not detain an executive's thinking for long. At once, his mind will shift to other matters. What to do with the children now would have to be faced at once. Should the temporary shelter be a tent or some makeshift assembly of temporary movable structures? Could the children go for a time to adjacent schools? Is there a vacant building anywhere available?

Such ideas would almost surely be gone over quickly. This stage we may think of as a preliminary survey or hasty review of all the more obvious possibilities, by way of sizing up the problem. To some of these the possibilities will be obvious, to others not so obvious; but here is planning at its very beginning. The process is mainly intellectual, though the legal aspects may be only slightly in the background. It is a search for something, an intellectual looking over the field. But what field? The field includes the shelterless children as its starting point and becomes more clear as one thinks of their numbers, of the amount of housing that has to be found, and of the kind of housing necessary.

While this picture is taking form in the executive's mind, he finds himself reaching out for possible solutions. From mere sensing of a loss of property, he shifts to mental evaluation of the loss; and following that, to a mental search for a quick means of meeting the loss. Thus the mind runs at once from stimulus to response and to and fro many times between them, both stimulus and response changing a little at each turn. At the outset, the stimulus is not very definite and the response is almost a trial-and-error type of behavior. An alert and vigorous executive will do all this exploring quickly, while a dull one will move more slowly and hestitantly.

Note is to be taken here that the planner's action (the process at its stage of forming a purpose to guide it) is governed by the nature of the job, by what intelligence recognizes as need in the situation. The thinking is not only the native mentality and energy of the planner in action, but these plus personality traits that prompt and shape his reactions, plus the knowledge he has with which to interpret what he recognizes in the case. These three elements—native capacity, personality, and knowledge—are the active ingredients in the behavior of the planner. The first, by definition here, is inherited; the second is partly inherited and partly learned; and the third is learned. One of these elements may dominate conduct at one point, an-

other at another, but much of the time all three will combine to shape behavior.

It must be kept in mind that, in such a problem, the executive may be forced to give thought to matters that do not properly belong to the situation. People rush in to urge adoption of this or that action. His own prejudices may tug at him to try this or that and then look for a way to justify the trial. This is a situation in which character and personality may be more important than knowledge.

For such a housing problem as this the executive may be able to find a solution quickly and alone, or he may have to bring in others, to assist him. By his exploring he will have established the scope and dimensions of his problem. With this much in hand, he will be able to decide upon how best to meet it. If the problem calls for extended study, to make that study must be his purpose. Having concluded this, he is at the end of his preliminary work on planning. He has arrived at the place for a decision. Decision is the first stage of action. When announced, decision becomes an order. As an administrative function, it is directing at its very beginning stage; it is directing, taking charge, and using the first fruits of planning.

Assembly and study of facts in the planning process. To examine the later stages of the process, let us shift from the problem of temporary to that of permanent housing; let it be the purpose to plan for the new plant. Our object will be to examine the planning process in a more complex form, in its later and more mature stages, and to ascertain whether there are still other elements or characteristics of the process, not found in the earlier stages. In the preliminary planning we found four elements, all active—sometimes separately, perhaps, but mostly together—as determining elements in the process. We may think of three of these—law, knowledge, and personality with its social pressures—as three forms of energy by which the process is animated and directed. Yet, each of these is a factor in the process, not merely because it exists, but because it does work. It

does work only because it is applied to something—to tasks to be done, to our fourth element.

The task in the case just examined was to find out how temporarily to house a school. There, it was apparent that the job, the work to be done, in large measure determined how the energies could best be applied in doing it. This does not mean that these energies are like heat or electricity or light, waiting to be turned on or directed by some intelligence within the job. Instead, they are in a manner alive and self-directing. The job can direct them only by virtue of what it is or may become. Furthermore, these energies will accomplish work only when they cause changes to take place in the job. How these changes take place and what makes them take place as the process goes on should be apparent in the planning of a school building.

The purpose, to develop a school plant, is the starting point. This is a large project and to accomplish it will require time. The plans must provide directions and specifications for each step in the development, and they must meet legal requirements. The size and complexity of the task suggest that, since the plant must be fitted to educational needs, and since these needs are dictated by the number and the natures of the children and by the needs and aspirations of the people and the government, the first step must be to find and define these educational needs. This is investigation, research. It is applying to a collection of facts a theory of what education is, to get the solution of a problem in school housing. That is, we are interpreting the problem, the job, by applying a theory to the facts about the children, the community, schoolteaching, government, finance, and many other things.

Here we have facts to search for, the school law to guide us, and a theory of education to apply to the facts. Application is made by a person whose own tastes and preferences may also claim a place. Intelligence has chosen what facts to assemble and how to classify them; it has chosen what theory to apply in interpreting the facts for use in develop-

ing a building; it has interpreted the law. The thing that seems most to dominate is the problem. It is with respect to the problem that all the facts are gathered, that the theory is chosen for use, that law is interpreted, that the reasoning is carried on. The preparation of a building plan compels the collection and use of certain facts (if we were constructing a curriculum, there would be other facts). It requires knowledge and respect for the law, and the use of a theory, too, in order to collect, classify, and interpret the facts as indexes to the kind of building needed. It is in this sense that we see here the working of our principle, that the nature of the job, of the work to be done, and of the end sought determines the nature of the process by which steps in the work can best be foreseen and planned for.

When all the facts are in hand pertaining to the number of children to be housed, to the instructional program with its numbers and sizes of classes, to the lists of subjects to be taught, to the schedule of work arranged; and when, parallel to this, a review has been made of the social program, the health program, the public-relations program (school-community activities); and when account has been taken of what amount and arrangement of space each of these may call for in order to have the school carry on in terms of a sound theory of learning, of health care, of personality development, the thinking may next turn to the task of setting down the demands in terms of types, numbers, and sizes of rooms and corridors, of doors and windows, of furniture and fixtures.

At this stage, facts, theories, law, and reasoning again are prominent, and personality may be; but again, all that takes place should take place because of and in terms of the nature of the problem. If art is necessary as education here, an art studio must be provided. If there are infants to care for, a nursery-school suite must be arranged. Similarly, it is in terms of our assembled facts and of our theory that every specification must be written. Libraries, labora-

tories, gymnasiums, a cafeteria, offices, rest rooms, and a little theater must be there or not, by virtue of the facts and the problem. This kind of thinking goes on and on. Which policy shall we follow in providing for laboratories? Shall we have a unit of work space and equipment for each student, or will most of the work be carried on by demonstration, with students participating? Shall the student use the space two or three or five days a week? There is hardly an item of any detail in a school plant that is not thus worked out in terms of the principle that facilities *must be designed to accord with educational need.* Their use, in turn, is dictated in part by what we choose to do in the room and in part by the theory and the form of activity by which we do it.

From this it does not appear that the second stage of planning reveals any new factors. The law operates silently; facts and reasoning about the problem, the job, are prominent; theory and, to some extent, personal taste, no doubt, help to shape interpretation.

The final stage, preparing the plans. To carry the study one step further, we would enter the final phase of the process in which all our facts and conclusions are to be expressed in a plan. Here we find need for many additional facts and principles, because our problem now is not only educational in the broad sense used above. It includes, besides, many factors belonging to the fields of architecture, engineering, economics, and landscaping, as well as additional legal considerations.

Let us assume that educational thinking has worked out and written down the specifications for which the plans must be drawn. If these educational data were complete, the plans could be drawn with no further educational thinking. Obviously, these data could not be entirely complete, so there will need to be a joining of several lines of expert work as the plans take form. From solving educational problems, the task turns to solving mechanical problems. From working with facts about children, it turns to

work with facts about wood and steel and cement. Yet, the job is still one of solving problems. The process is the same. What has been added is only more kinds or applications of law, more kinds and uses of facts and principles, more reasoning, and some different skills. The job, the law, knowledge, and the personal factor are still the essential elements in the process. The process is essentially intellectual and is best described still as that of problem solving.

5. *Other Factors That Influence the Process*

Other ways of viewing the elements of the planning process. Above, attention was called to the three-dimensional nature of planning—to time, the job, and the activating force, or energy, as the essential terms of the problem of planning. Although our analysis of these elements has been far from exhaustive, it has been adequate, perhaps, to show what the process is like in itself. At the outset, it was shown that planning grows out of various needs and circumstances, that planning does not go on in a vacuum, and that it does not go on automatically; especially, it does not go on apart from the planner, who is motivated by an endless complex of interests and social pressures.

The question for further study here is not as to what makes up the process, but rather, as to whether the time, the planner, and the environmental circumstances may not influence the process in still other ways. Time is not a question of the duration of the activity alone. It may also be one of appropriateness. To be useful, plans must be ready in advance of the time when action is needed. Similarly, the planner is not just any person, but one who knows how and wants to plan. Then, too, planning cannot go on equally well everywhere and under any and all circumstances.

What we are searching for here is the nature of the administrative process. We wish to use it, not merely to formulate or understand it as an abstraction; so we cannot have the process burdened by inhibitions or impediments.

In order that the process may be used effectively, freeing it from distractions is as necessary as being able to recognize its ingredients and compound them into effective action.

Timing the planning activity. If planning is a definite function, a practical problem, a job, then there is a definable need for it, and the need exists at some special time. The budget should be planned before the year opens, because operations depend upon it. Legally, schools could not operate without it.[12] Plans for registration of students should be ready on registration day if the plans are to serve a proper purpose. That is, there is a date on which planning must end and action begin. Similarly, if plans are to be ready at a specified time, then work on them must begin in advance of that. Setting the date for this may be more difficult; but it must be the obligation of administration to try to judge, not only when to begin, but also what will be the rate of progress in planning.

The time to begin, the rate of progress, and the time to complete the planning are significant in yet another way. To ensure results—complete plans ready for use when needed—one must look to their quality, as well as to their completeness, and to their effect upon planners and the entire going enterprise, as well as to the immediate product of the planning. If administration has good plans, that is one thing. If, in addition, it has a better informed staff, a staff with increased zeal for the action that is to follow, that is better still. If, instead of this latter, there is indifference or confusion or discord in the staff, then, however good they may be, the plans will have little momentum and may actually introduce difficulties, which direction—the next step in administration—will have to overcome. One may not, by proper timing, introduce any new element into the process,

[12] Many contracts, covering much of the overhead expense of operations, carry over from year to year. These items are automatically budgeted in advance. The budget planning merely puts them formally into the place they already hold legally.

but he can change the behavior of the elements already there.

Selecting the planners. What is true of timing for the planning work is true, also, of choosing those who are to plan. Personalities vary greatly, interest in and equipment for planning vary from person to person. In so far as personality and training play special parts in planning, it follows that for each planning job those should be chosen who are best equipped to contribute to the total task of getting good plans and improving the staff and the institution as a whole.

Evidence that it matters as to who does the planning is to be found in the personal, as well as the technical, nature of this function. If planning is getting ready to act, who can do this better than the actor himself? When other things are equal, the actor may have the purpose of the service as clearly in mind as anyone; but, besides this, he has a sense of being responsible, a sense that no one else could feel so keenly. The plan, being his to execute, his own to live by as well as to work by, and being the ladder by which he may hope to climb to heights in his calling, provides motivation of great power. Here, then, is the one question left: Is this interested future actor equal to others in planning competency? If so, then without question, he should help with the planning.

Not many decades ago, curriculums were made by superintendents, were authorized by boards, and were handed to teachers for use, often with strict orders to follow them. In those days, superintendents were more experienced and often better trained than teachers, even in matters pertaining to the curriculum. These differences are greatly changed now. No superintendent today would think of planning a curriculum without full and major participation by the teachers and supervisors. The reasons are that the latter are far better equipped than he for much of the work, and that he knows the only curriculum that will be taught is the

one that represents the knowledge, skill, viewpoint, and interest of the teacher. The curriculum at work is scarcely once removed from the teacher's own interests and methodology, which, in turn, are but once removed from his personality, or self. One could repeat these comments with but slight variation for planning the budget, nor would they have to be altered in principle for planning a book of rules and regulations.

School management used to move largely in terms of authority. Now authority is quite as useful and as powerful as before, but some nine-tenths of management goes forward primarily in terms of knowledge, authority being used mainly as a means of official recognition or authorization of what knowledge shows to be the right action or decision. Schools could no more be administered without authority now than before. Now, however, knowledge is not only far more necessary but far more widely used, and everywhere it is the knowledge of those who are directly responsible that is important.

From these illustrations we may fairly conclude that, since it is the nature of the process of planning to end in *readiness of actors,* as well as in a *set of directions* for their acting, it follows that planning must be done by those who are to execute the plans, even though others may assist. If to plan is to make oneself ready, it is because the purpose of the plan has to become the actor's purpose. Planning work should have the effect of rousing in the planner such energy, desire, and understanding as will provide alertness and going power for the anticipated action. In such a case, the plans are not only on paper, they are also in the minds and bodies of key people; they have become the purposes, the will, of those who are to execute them. They are intelligence, drive, readiness, all focused upon their goal and only awaiting release by authority to change from plan to performance.[13]

[13] See L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943.

One can, it is true, think of cases in which those who plan need not be those who execute the plan—for instance, the school calendar. But a close look at this task shows that the really interested parties are the parents—not the teachers, the custodians, the clerical force of the schools, alone. Does anyone suppose that in this matter the superintendent's office takes no account of the public interest? One's proper *right* or *obligation* to participate in planning under the principle developed above is always a relative matter. Compare a teacher's interest in planning for a new salary schedule with his interest in planning and supervising a cafeteria in his school. Or compare the knowledge that a teacher could contribute to planning for a curriculum with what he might contribute to the plans for a school auditorium. A teacher has some interest and some knowledge about all these matters, but he has much more interest and knowledge that affects some than that affects others.

For these reasons, as well as for many others directly practical, participation of any one person in planning may vary from little to much; it may be direct and highly responsible or only indirect and of minor consequence, either to the plans or to the contributor. In many cases, planning may involve extensive study that has to be done expertly. Often the findings of such study are all that matters. In such a case, for teachers, principals, or supervisors to do the work is in every sense wasteful—taking the time and energy of experts in instruction to do work in which they are likely to be inexpert and worse still, not vitally interested. Doing work of this kind is more likely to unfit than to prepare them for using the plans that are to be built. It is economy in school management, therefore, to employ experts in research with clerical help to do work that may distract more than it will ready those who are expertly engaged in other services.

To restate our principle with its modifications, we would say: Let all participate in planning for their own work, provided that they be asked to contribute to aspects in which they are relatively expert and in which they can be expected

to have a genuine and proper interest. This proviso, stated negatively is: Ask no one to participate, when to contribute would distract the person more than it would prepare him for his major service to the schools. In both cases, there will be exceptions to the rule.

From these cases it is clear that to feel enthusiasm and will and a sense of responsible ownership in planning, one must have an end in view, an end in which the plans are to play a part. If this connection between planning and execution of plans is close in time, direct in bearing, and vital in determining what may happen to one's own job, then planning is strongly motivated by the fact that it offers an opportunity to predetermine what may happen. If the connection is loose, the bearing only indirect, and the probable effects on execution not important, then a vital part of the motive for working hard at planning would be lacking. There will always be a few people who delight in planning as an end in itself and a very few who would rather plan than to carry on their regular work. Such exceptions need not detain us here.

If this idea is applied, choosing the planners for long-term planning would seem to be quite different from choosing those for short-term planning. Persons who expect to be in the schools for only a short time will be less likely to be deeply concerned about work for the distant future. Those who expect to be in the schools for years may, on the other hand, be impatient with tentative makeshift or short-term planning.

Taken too literally, however, this idea may be confusing or even misleading, since one's ability to plan does not always run parallel with one's proper concern about the work in question. Good planning must be wise, as well as energetic. The young graduate, newly appointed, is apt to bring plenty of will to serve but only a limited understanding; the elderly person, anticipating retirement soon, is apt to display less enthusiasm but, on the average, will rate high in understanding. The situation becomes still more complicated when we consider how still other things may affect one's enthusiasm for planning. One's training, his interest in that kind of

work, the professional opportunities such an activity might open for one, the social pleasure and opportunity it might afford, the relief from other less interesting work—these are matters that might help to determine the drive one would feel for the task.

It is apparent, therefore, that although the connection between the planning and the execution of plans is an important consideration in determining the amount of will and the sense of responsibility that may go into the planning, there are other matters that may play a part.

External factors that condition planning. So far, our study of the planning process has been concerned with the factors that enter into the activity rather directly. The law authorizes and directs; the nature of the job provides the field of action and the terms and limits of the problem faced; and the planner—with his knowledge, his interests, and his character—operating under various social pressures, keeps the process going. Study of the quality of the process, a very important matter to management, reveals that the activity varies with the capacity and enthusiasm and sincerity of the planner. It follows, then, that the administrator must know how to choose the right people, those who will come to planning with the right interests and motives, as well as with the right understanding. He must, besides, be concerned with training in service programs as a means of improvement.

In reference to the job, as one of the major elements in the planning process, only incidental account has been taken of the external conditioning facts and circumstances that help to shape the job. The tax burden upon the people, the general level of culture in the community, and the interest of the people in their schools help to shape the job. The needs of the community for roads, parks, hospitals, fire-protection equipment, sewers, public libraries, public debt, perhaps, are parallel interests that make claim upon the public purse and, so, help to determine the size of the school budget, which has much to do in shaping the administrative task.

As one gets closer to the task, other factors enter to play a

part in the case. The interests and capacities of the people and of the children, the kind of life that lies ahead for the children, and not tradition alone, not their present interests alone, must guide the planner in deciding upon what types of schools, curriculums, courses, activities, and kinds of work facilities are to be planned for. The bearing of this idea is very important and far-reaching for planning. The schools must provide education for each child, not only as an individual, but also, as a citizen in this country, this world, and this time. Thus, back of planning for a building or for a curriculum or for any detail, lie these seemingly outside matters of public interest, economic ability, and our educational philosophy, as well as the more immediate facts about children and books and rooms and teachers.

6. *Arrangements for the Planning Service*

Planning for the planning service. A study of the nature of the planning process must, of necessity, take account of the practical question, how to provide for its use in an institution. Planning is essentially an intellectual activity, as one considers the process alone; but as one considers the fact that the process never exists except by and at the will of individuals, and the fact that a host of outside factors help to shape and influence it in many ways, one is compelled to realize that as an administrative activity there is less interest in the process as such than there is in what it can do in management. Our study of what the process consists of is primarily with a view to understanding better how to use it. External forces that facilitate or that interfere with it must affect its final worth and, therefore, its nature as an instrument for management. Accordingly, our study of the process of planning is not complete until it has taken account of how the function is to be made a part of the administrative machinery and program.

If planning is to be more than an incidental matter, it must be officially established as a feature of the management machinery. This may be done in various ways. By his

assignment, each employee may be made specifically responsible for planning his own work; planning for certain matters may be established as the function of groups or of committees; a research department may be organized; or all these plans may be used together.

Planning by individuals. That every employee should be responsible, at least in some part, for planning his own work has been clearly enough indicated in our analysis of the planning process. Points upon which an assignment contract is not specific, but for which the employee is made responsible, are purposely left to discretion. This means that discretion must be made use of in this performance. If in a given case an employee does nothing, it must be presumed that he has deliberately chosen to do nothing. He cannot avoid the fact that he was appointed to do what was needed in the case. In this assignment he accepted the responsibility and the authority to act; and both parties assumed that he had the knowledge and the skills required, and that he would apply them properly.

In school work, as in banking or manufacturing or merchandising, planning ranges from very simple to very complex forms of activities. The teacher will plan alone just how he will arrange his desk. He may have the children help plan the routine for conducting recitations or for preparing class reports. He would plan the schedule of classes with other teachers and the principal, especially if certain facilities, such as art rooms, laboratories, auditorium, library, and play facilities, had to be used jointly by many classes. Each employee may contribute to the planning of the budget —some, by preparing estimates of their own needs for supplies, others by assembling and consolidating estimates for a department or a school, others by estimating the tax rate required, and so on. In all cases, planning is in relation to the job, and responsibility for planning and performance must be kept close together. When the whole of a job is assigned to one person, that one may be quite free to do the planning; most school jobs are, in fact, but parts or units in

larger jobs, however, and when this is true, both planning and performance must reckon with the interests of other parts or units. So, responsibility to plan must often indicate planning with others.

Planning by committees.[14] If each individual should be both free and responsible in respect to planning his own work, in so far as the task is his alone, it should follow that for any task that is to be performed by a number of people the planning should be the duty of all concerned. This is based upon the principle that planning is vitally related to performance, and that to separate the two is to take a part of the intelligence and motive (the essential power) out of performance.

Responsibility of more than one person is involved in such tasks as the following: the budget's preparation, administration, and control; development of the educational program, with its many divisions and curriculums; preparation of the building program, as a whole and part by part by schools; development of the salary and wage scales; formulation of all general policies affecting the government of the schools; development of the public-relations programs of the schools; and planning for much of the administrative mechanism, with its processes and routines. In planning for the performance of these large units of work, we have built up a system whereby authority has been arranged in a hierarchy, and the performance conforms to a system of special fields of knowledge. The object has been to treat the task as one task, but to apply to the various phases or aspects of the task the particular intelligence required for its handling.

Many of these major tasks break down readily into parts, while others must retain almost complete unity. For instance, the educational program is a single problem for a university or for a school district when considered from the standpoint of major educational purpose, or of cost to pro-

[14] See H. O. Hilary, "The Position and Functions of Committees in Local Administration." *Public Administration*, 7:376–386, October, 1929.

vide, or of the staff required or available, or of the school plant and teaching facilities; but in planning for it, one comes quickly to a breakdown of the whole into curriculums, courses, social-activity programs, libraries, and laboratories; and still more breakdown is found as one moves to the administration of it. On the other hand, the preparation of a set of general policies for the school system or the development of a salary schedule presents a different type of problem. It is important that all who are properly concerned shall help in planning for these matters, but neither of these breaks down into separate divisions by schools or by other groups. Unity and consistency for all employees alike are the essence of such schedules. Similarly, policy must be policy for all individuals, classes, schools, and divisions of the system alike; so the thinking and planning essential to the formulation of a policy must be in terms of the needs of all. If one breaks this problem down for study, he must do it in a way that will not destroy the unity of purpose and function for which it provides.

It is obvious from these cases that planning for planning presents some problems. If by its nature a task is the proper concern of an entire school staff, the question arises as to how so large a group can take hold together. To answer this, we should adhere to our theory of starting with the nature of the job. In cases in which, because of the nature of the task, it is important that all shall study the problem and help to plan, it follows that administration must find a way for all to participate.[15] Planning is thinking, and thinking goes on best when there are few distractions. A large group may stimulate talk, but it usually disturbs thinking. Individuals in a small group often can think together, one member raising a question, which another answers. Many people are timid or totally submerged when in a large

[15] The object is not to provide "busy work" or to provide activity or mere display of democratic machinery. It must be genuine planning. Neither is it a question of anyone's personal or legal rights in the case.

group, although they may be active when they can speak to others personally. The large group is practical when the purpose is to disseminate information; the small group, when it is to develop information.

The committee idea seems to be the answer in such a case. To use the committee, it will be necessary, not only to form small groups, each in terms of the common interests of its members in the problem, but to make sure that the work of each committee fits neatly into that of all other committees and holds true to the central purpose of the task as a whole.

Planning by research specialists. A third method of providing for the planning service is by use of a formally organized research division. This makes specialists in research available for the work of planning. This idea, which was introduced into public schools soon after the beginning of the school-survey movement in 1910, is now common practice. From the standpoint of this study, the idea calls for closer examination.

When research was first formally established in the schools, there was concern, on the one hand, lest research might become lowly and inferior scientifically and, on the other, lest it might be too high and scientific to be useful. Very soon, too, administrative powers began to be used by researchers, not only to direct research, but also to apply its findings in the schools. This is important history, for it reveals complete neglect of the principle by which this study of the nature of administration is being carried on.[16] Had research activity been shaped by the nature of the schools' needs for research, by the nature of the work to be done, these three wrong approaches could have been avoided. Research cannot lose respectability by doing a good job, however commonplace it may be. It can neither gain nor

[16] For the early history of this movement, see Harold B. Chapman, *Organized Research in Education.* Ohio State University Studies, Bureau of Educational Research, *Monograph* 7. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1927.

retain respectability by conducting the most scientific of inquiries in realms or by procedures that do not answer to school needs. As for having authority to direct and enforce its findings, that is trying to apply the authority of laws and of administration where only the authority of knowledge will do the work.

It was soon found that research must be servant, not master, and that its job depended mainly upon school needs and only secondarily upon the interests of research itself. Research can take hold of any problem; but to do so effectively it must be guided, not by authority of law, but by insight into the nature and the terms of its problem. When a research department is organized upon this basis, it is easily usable, not as a boss, but as a guide and helper, in the solution of any and all kinds of problems. It can help by advice or by actual performance of research, whether the problem is large or small, and whether it is the problem of one person or of a committee or of the entire staff.

By our principle, the use of a research specialist should never separate planning from performance. It should help the individuals, the committee, the faculty; but it should not relieve them of responsibility for planning their own proper work. It is to be remembered that in all cases the object of planning is to ready and to improve the planner, as well as to provide good plans to guide action. To ready a person for his work is to develop viewpoint, interest, and understanding, which combine to form motive, drive, and understanding for his work.

Setting up machinery for planning. The arrangements for the planning function will vary, from little or no formal mention of it to definite assignments to individuals or committees or organized divisions or bureaus of research. Though it is seldom mentioned in a contract, or even in an assignment of duties, planning is always implied as a part of an employee's duties. It is similarly implied that, in planning for his own work, the employee will respect the rights of others and all the traditional proprieties of conduct, as

well as the implications of the science and philosophy of education and the laws, regulations, and instructions of his superior officers.

In providing for planning work, other than that done by each individual on his own work separately, some arrangements have to be made. The question of who is to be responsible for this additional work, of how it is to be arranged for, can be important. Someone must discover the need for planning, someone must take steps to have it done. The way these matters are cared for may have important effects upon the planning activity.

Presumably, there can be no problem of management that does not fall within the realm of some officer or employee within the hierarchy of authority and responsibility. If the nature of the problem is to be our guide, then the place of its origin is an index as to who is responsible for it. System-wide problems are the province of the central office in a city, a county, or a state school system, and of the chief executive's office in a college. Problems that fall primarily in a school must be the responsibility of the principal; and those in a department, of the executive head. In case a classroom, a department, or a school has a joint interest with other groups, there must be joint effort in the planning.

In the arrangements for such work, the object should be to have all who are interested participate, either directly or by some plan of representation. When a committee is composed of representatives, the question of who is the best representative in the case is important. The importance will be indicated by the nature of the task and the bearing that the plans may have upon the work and interests of those concerned. Choice of representatives should be by the executive when there are no personal interests to safeguard, by those represented when personal interests are important. The object should be to keep all proper interests protected and active, in order to have just dealing and the drive that comes from a sense of being a participant or of being truly

represented; with this must go the purpose to get the best available talent for the work.

There is no point in democratic control, merely as such, but great point in essential democracy, which, in such a case, protects the people concerned and, at the same time guarantees the best in output of work. This is democracy alike for those who have rights in the planning and for those who are to be affected by the plans when they are executed.

This same method of reasoning should be applied to the committee's own organization. Choice of a chairman or the formation of subgroups should have in mind both the interests of the members and the kinds of talent needed to direct the committee in its planning.

Bringing the several points of this analysis together in outline form, we would have the following:

Planning is getting ready to perform a task. It is a means to two ends—the development of interest and understanding and motives for action, and the preparation of specifications for the task.

The need for planning in school administration is due to the complexity of school work. School work is complex for several reasons:

1. Education is a function of our government; our government is built upon the concept of democracy; so it follows that our philosophy of education must embody this same concept.

2. In a world of so much change there will be a constant struggle for security, stability, and permanence in the social order; but with this, man's natural inquisitiveness causes him to invent, which in turn compels change in the social order. This latter fact man tries to use to achieve social progress.

3. Laws creating the schools have to be formed in the light of (1) and (2). In this process, there must also be taken into account the nature of the educative process itself.

4. The educative process is determined by the laws of

human nature—learning, growth, and development, and of the interests, needs, and capacity of society. Our science and philosophy of education keep developing new and fuller understanding of these factors.

5. The actual processes of management are complex because they must express the philosophy of our state and of our society and of our schools, and they must keep abreast of scientific study.

6. Finally, the practical facts and circumstances of the time play a part. Finance, physical facilities, the level of culture, the climate—all these help to complicate school administration.

The problems created by what these six approaches to a study of administration suggest reveal why administration must plan; also they suggest that there must be different types of planning, such as emergency planning; regular, positive, on-going planning; planning to prevent accidents or to outwit evil influences.

The analysis, up to this point, has thrown much light upon the nature of planning by revealing its meaning and the facts and conditions that give rise to it. The next step undertakes to examine the planning process itself as a form of activity. The process is characterized as three-dimensional, in that it may be viewed from the standpoint of time, from that of the work to be planned for, and from that of the characteristics of the planning activity. The process is examined at its origin, as it is formulating its purposes, as it is assembling its data for study, and as it is preparing its conclusions as plans. From this study note is taken of the fact that, in all stages alike, the process is largely intellectual; it involves use of authority (legal and administrative), of knowledge of education and of the job in question; it requires time to carry it on; it is carried on by persons who act in terms of their knowledge, their personal preferences, and the pressure of public opinion and other outside forces. It is noted, also, that at all stages in the process the nature of the activity

is determined by the nature of the job that is being planned for, that planning is solving problems the terms of which are to be found in the nature of the job.

Of the elements found in the process—authority, knowledge, personality, the work or the job planned for, time, and environmental circumstances—the behavior is reasonably predictable, except for that of personality with the social pressures upon it. It is clear that each of these elements has a place to fill in planning work, but the performance of each is likely to be decided in part by the character and interests of the planner. In planning, as a rational process, however, one principle stands out clearly, *viz.*, that the nature of the process of planning as a phase of management is determined by the nature of the work planned for.

This analysis has implications for management as follows:

1. Time as a factor is a matter of when to start, how rapidly to plan, and when to complete work. Need in the case must be the guide.

2. Choice of persons for planning should follow the principle that, since planning brings readiness for action, all employees must plan for their own work and must participate in planning when they have joint responsibilities with others.

In providing for the planning, it is clear that by our analysis a part of it must be done by individuals; a part, by groups or committees; and that a part can be done by specialists in research. The principles revealed by our analysis of the needs for planning and of the nature of the planning process are the guide in choosing a plan.

Chapter 3. ORGANIZATION AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

This chapter has for its concern the nature of organization, the second of the five major elements of the administrative process. The term is defined and its application, as noun and as verb, is illustrated, both as a distinctive type of activity and as it operates with other elements of the total process of administration.

As a first step in the analysis of this function, attention is called to the part played by persons, on the one hand, and by the paper machinery—regulations, forms, calendars, contracts, schedules—on the other, in any organization, the latter being designed as extensions of the powers of persons, to deal with complex matters. Examination of the nature, the importance, the possibilities, and the limitations of the paper part of an organization reveals how the personal and the impersonal elements of an organization work together.

The next step is concerned with the underlying theory upon which organization is to be designed. The autocratic and the democratic concepts are examined for the particular character that each might give to an organization. How authority is conceived, controlled, and brought to bear to produce unity of effort, efficiency, and good will; how the philosophy of administration is related to the philosophy of instruction; and what each may contribute to produce a better organization—all these are considered.

When the major factors that are involved in organization have been established and, with these, the philosophy that is to guide it, scrutiny turns to a more intimate view of its nature. As is true of planning, the need for organization

lies in the complexity of the work it must do. Many persons must work together; an instructional program must be formed to fit the needs of students, with a view to its orderly execution; the housing and equipment and supplies available must be used as they are or may be reconstructed. Each of these three divisions of the school organization is complex in itself and doubly so in the fact that the three must be so related that each is but a phase of the total organization. Defining purposes, discovering the functions required in the service, assigning responsibilities, developing mechanical devices to facilitate working together, apportioning authority to fit responsibility, and understanding where knowledge is to be relied upon are revealed as the major aspects of the organizing function.

1. *Wide Application of the Term Organization*[1]

Formal organization in schools. The term organization is used widely to refer to any collection of persons, materials, procedures, ideas, or facts, so arranged and ordered that in each case the combination of parts makes a meaningful whole. An organization of men is an arrangement of individuals whereby each member may contribute to or participate in a joint activity, in conformity with a planned purpose and procedure, to the end that the talents and energies of all may be applied economically, effectively, and harmoniously in the activity.

The employees of a school system are organized as a staff; the children, as schools, grade groups, and classes. The board of education, the central office, the school, department, division, team, and faculty are units in the organization of the school personnel. Plot maps, blueprints, and inventories represent organization of materials; the school

[1] The place of organization in the total scheme of public administration, particularly as it applies to what he calls the high command, is brought out by Henri Fayol, "The Administrative Theory in the State." Chap. IV in *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick, (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

calendar, the daily time schedule, and many of the school regulations stand as prearranged and organized procedures; the salary roll, the accounting system, the scholastic records, the school directory, the library catalogue, the filing system, and the classroom roll book are organizations of facts and ideas. Facts and ideas may be organized for the sole use of one person, as the teacher's roll book; or for the use of many, as the book of rules and regulations, the curriculum, or the library catalogue. We organize people for any joint activity. We organize materials and facts either for the common use of many or for the frequent use of any one person.[2]

Our way of life in organization. These references to the more prominent and more formal units of organization in a school system do not exhaust the use that is made of the organizing principle from day to day. There is a vast amount of informal machinery in the form of social proprieties, customs, and traditions, and in the routines of life and work and play that have been built up into attitudes and beliefs and tastes and habits in the individual and modes of behavior in groups, providing a basis for common understanding and action. This social pattern or structure is an organized manner of life. It is just as compelling as any formally organized procedures or routines—perhaps more compelling—and it plays a large part, not only because of what it does directly to provide a unified life in the school, but quite as much because all organized effort assumes its active existence. A teacher can no more ignore the ethics of the profession than he can the published rules of the board; and being socially ostracized for bad manners is one of the severest punishments a child can be given. Membership in the profession and in the school is a reality to teachers and pupils and it is highly prized.[3]

[2] William Bateson, *Principles of Organization, also Collecting and Recording Statistics and Office Equipment.* London: Sir Isaac Pittman & Sons, Ltd., 1923.

[3] Whoever in his college days studied Bentham's *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* must recall the exhaustive

Our use of the organizing principle. The place of organization in school work seems even further extended when one thinks in terms of the verb rather than of the noun. That is, organizing is one of the major activities or elements in the administrative process. Without its unifying influence, the planning, directing, coordinating, and controlling elements of that process would make but poor headway with management. The organizing principle is being used whenever we act in conscious regard for what someone else has done, is doing, or later may do; *e.g.*, whenever we are playing a part in a joint undertaking. Whether we behave with reference to the routine of social proprieties or to a consciously planned program, we are acting under compulsion of organized society. Although, in the former, the procedure may be automatic or mechanical and any organizing effort may be lacking, in the latter, effort is consciously directed with regard for the organizing principle. It is true that many routines are made use of in school work; but even with all such helps, there is little time during the day when executives are not facing problems, most of which involve the organization of facts to solve, or having to make decisions that involve actions requiring cooperative effort.

Thinking is essentially a process of organizing facts and ideas with a view to action or to getting other information. When a principal interviews a new pupil, he may follow a routine that is dictated by the organized form on which he enters his record of facts; but with each entry, he reconstructs his ideas of the pupil and, so, his judgment of where to place the pupil for instruction. Thus, whether one is laying out a program for one pupil or arranging the daily work schedule for a class or developing the school budget or planning the layout of a building or arranging the school system as a whole, he is in reality organizing. Besides, all

---

analysis by which Bentham sought to establish, in another connection, the principle here suggested, by his analysis of the nature of human motives. As our customs are rooted in our natures, our standards of right and wrong and, so, of law are rooted in our customs.

who work in a school system are parts of one or of many of its units of organization and must do all their work of thinking, planning, and performing, with careful regard for its bearing upon what others may be expected to do; and the organizing principle must guide one, whether he is constructing or operating the machine or putting grist into it.[4]

2. *The Relation of Paper to Human Machinery in School Organization*

Paper and human elements in organization. Since all the organizations of information, facts, and materials used in a school system are designed to promote the joint efforts of the officers, employees, pupils, and others having dealings with the schools, we may think of all such organizations as the paper machinery, essential as a means of defining and giving orderly direction to the human machinery of the school system. Since the persons of an organization use this paper machinery constantly, the problem of organizing the facts, materials, and procedures is so closely connected with the human machinery that, in reality, it is but a part of the problem of organizing the people.

Although each unit of any school organization may require special study to develop, yet, whether it be a daily work schedule for a class, a card catalogue by which to locate books in the library, a curriculum to be followed by a thousand students, a budget to govern revenues and expenses for the entire school system for a year; or (of persons) whether it be a committee, a class, a school, or the major structure

[4] No student of this field should fail to become acquainted with Frederick Winslow Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911; and with C. Bertrand Thompson, *The Theory and Practice of Scientific Management.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917. These books are both interesting as pioneering efforts in this field. For a contrast of the approaches of Taylor and Fayol, see Norman M. Pearson, "Fayolism as the Necessary Complement of Taylorism." *American Political Science Review,* 39:68–80, February, 1945. Regardless of what Taylor may have left out in his analysis, he set people to thinking about the possibility of organized effort.

of the entire school system, in all cases alike, need for the unit arises in the need to facilitate cooperative effort. Each unit, paper or human, therefore, is but a part of a complex whole. Things on paper are but reflections of facts needed by persons or of prearranged procedures for the use of persons. They are guides for the persons who are doing the work. They express in word, figure, formula, or picture, many details for ready reference and review, which the persons would often not be able to carry wholly in mind, but without which they could not work harmoniously with others or consistently with their own previous procedures.

The part of the total mechanism of an organization that is on paper is far more extensive and important than is generally realized. The items above listed are but a few samples of the organizing activities required and of the organized forms and data used continuously in a school system. The procedure of a class reciting has been so planned by the teacher that it may go forward in an orderly way, orderly from the standpoint of the way the children may best move in their learning activities in that instance. Facts from many sources, current and historical facts pertaining to each child, are assembled on a card, arranged with a view to facilitating consultation of that source by the teacher or counselor or principal of the school. The book of rules and regulations setting forth a definition of purposes, powers, and duties; outlining programs and procedures; and authorizing use of specified materials is a far more minute, exact, and dependable guide to action than what anyone can carry in his mind as an assignment to duty by his employer. Such a book of directions is organized with a view to making every item easy to find by a reader, and especially to enable one to see his own place in the total plan of organization.

The paper machinery remembers for us. The paper machinery might be thought of as the working tools or as specifications for the guidance of the human machinery, but it seems desirable here to stress the close connection it has with the human machine. It carries loads that otherwise

would have to be carried in memory and that would have to be sure to be recalled at every proper time and place. It does even more than this; it keeps facts, definitions, divisions of labor, purposes, plans, procedures, all defined in unchanging terms. Paper organizations never forget; they have no selfish motives, no pride in getting more power. They are never lazy or mean or indifferent, and they need not be stupid. It is true that at times they crystallize things that should be kept elastic, and, at times, may even prevent growth; but they need not do these evil things. Their virtue is consistency, continuity, completeness, permanence, readiness for action—all bases for common understanding. It is not their fault if the personal machine neglects to keep them alive. It is on this point of keeping them alive that we see how organizing and reorganizing become a continuous obligation of the personal machine. A sawyer never starts a log toward the saw until he has adjusted the carrying mechanism. All paper parts of an organization need similar, if less frequent, readjustments for use.

From this it is clear that any organization that exists as a plan for extensive cooperative action is complicated enough as to its own nature, as to the tasks it performs and as to the procedures it must use, so that no one person can carry in mind full directions for all that the organization requires of him as one of its members. So, to supplement this mental picture an extensive paper machinery must be used as a means of extending the reach of the personal powers of the participants.

3. *Opposing Theories of Organization*[5]

The autocratic vs. the democratic principle. There are two widely different concepts of how an organization should be made and how it should operate. According to one, the power that holds the organization together and directs it

[5] For a discussion of conflicting doctrines of administration, of a different sort but useful as a background, see Frederick F. Blachly and Miriam E. Oatman, *Federal Regulatory Action and Control.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1940.

resides in and is applied by one person; according to the other, that power may be unified but, as for its origin and use, originates in and is distributed to all parts of the organization. The governing principle of the one type we call autocracy; of the other, democracy. Both provide for unity of action, for cooperation; but in one case, power to direct or to command does not, in the other it does, have to answer to those who are commanded. Or, in the one case, policies and plans are formed by the executive and handed down; whereas, in the other, they are built up by all who help to execute them.

There is no reason why an autocrat could not govern by democratic procedures if he chose; but if he gave up his powers, he would not be an autocrat. Similarly, the members of a democratic organization could place autocratic powers in the hands of one person if they so desired; but if that power were irrecallable, they would not be a democracy. However, if the autocrat used democratic methods but kept his powers, the government still would be an autocracy; likewise, if the democracy used autocratic methods but retained its power in distribution, it still would be a democracy. How the power originates, where it lies, and who controls it is what counts finally.

How these principles work in practice. The relative merits of these two concepts of government have been debated for ages. Both have been tried in many places, each with varying results. Each has boasted its superiority and sometimes men have fought to prove it. What part of their success or their failure we should attribute to the principles of their respective schemes of organization, and what part to the persons who happened to be directing them, it would be difficult to say.[6] Each of the schemes depends upon unity of the purposes and efforts of its members as its first guarantee of success.

Autocracy can get unity of purpose quickly, since it is but

[6] "For forms of government let fools contest whatever is best administered is best." Pope.

the will of the executive; democracy attains unity of purpose but slowly, since it is the work of many to help in forming it. Autocracy can get unity of effort quickly and surely by choosing only those who will take orders promptly and execute them well, and by dismissing all others; democracy must depend for unity of effort upon the faith of its members in democracy and their will to make it work, which is a slower and less sure method.[7] In an autocracy the executive commands and gets prompt obedience. In a democracy the executive proposes and gets discussion, criticism, and counter suggestions, out of which the members formulate what is to be the command; if by this time differences of opinion have not produced bitterness, then, when it is given, the command may evoke a fair degree of cooperative effort.

By this reasoning one can build up quite a case of "everybody governing and nobody gets governed," against democratic organizations. However, efficiency is not altogether a matter of getting quick action. The people who are served want service. So, what the organization does to its own members and what kind of service it provides are what count most.

The age-old debate as to the merits of these concepts. On the relative merits of the two concepts as forms of government there is an extensive literature, to which the reader may turn.[8] In this country the choice is already made in favor of democracy, and on the merits of that choice (except for a few frustrated people) we are not in doubt. Our

[7] Felix Frankfurter, *The Public and Its Government.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930. Commenting upon democracy, Frankfurter says, "Democracy is not remotely an automatic device for good government, nor even for a peaceful society." He says, further, "It depends more upon wisdom and knowledge than does any other form of government."

[8] An exceptionally clear analysis of some of the weaknesses of democracy has been presented in one of the Stafford Little lectures at Princeton University, entitled *Dilemmas of Leadership in the Democratic Process,* by Chester I. Barnard. University Extension Fund, Herbert L. Baker Foundation, Princeton University, 1939.

problem is not that of choosing which concept to use, but of learning how to use the one we have chosen. Democracy is not just a government machine, to be adopted or not, at will; but also a mode of life and a method or manner of behavior in self-government.

In our country, education is a function of the state and, so, is a part of our total scheme of government. In the school we want democracy as the plan of control and as the mode of life in a very special way. First, the school is one of our means for caring for, rearing, and equipping our children for citizenship and for life. We hope that, through living and working in the school, our children may acquire interests, attitudes, habits, and knowledges by which—partly because they have been accustomed to a democratic form of society—they may desire our way of life and be competent to live democratically always. Second, education in our country is concerned with truth and justice and freedom and progress, and with their continuous pursuit and application to living. By education we hope to make our children intelligently critical of the world they are in—citizens, not subjects. We want obedience and respect, but not blind obedience or respect based on fear. We want our children to feel that the government is their own, not that they are its property.

This concept of education can be inculcated only by teachers, principals, supervisors, and counselors who are themselves living as free individuals and working together cooperatively with mutual respect for one another, and with full consciousness of their own rights and their own duties to play a part in the government of the school.

These meager suggestions as to what is meant by democracy in school administration are enough to indicate that democracy cannot be adopted suddenly; rather, it has to be achieved by study and experience and the will to attain it.[9]

[9] For a brief but effective illumination of the principles of democracy, see Charles E. Merriam, "The Assumptions of Democracy." *Political Science Quarterly*, 53:328–349, September, 1938.

For its success it depends more upon its merits than upon its powers. Before the nature of organization is investigated, however, the particular ways in which these concepts are applied in school organization must be considered.

How these principles stand in American schools. In school organization in this country one finds few if any real autocracies. What we do find quite often is a poor use of the democratic principles. The board of education or the superintendent or a principal retains and exercises authority which, by the nature of the case, should be delegated to others. One often sees an even worse abuse of the principal in the classroom, where the task of training in the ways of democracy is supposed to be one of the major concerns. The reason for these injections of autocracy may be many. Love of power to order others, fear of the consequences of sharing power, conviction in the mind of the one in authority that his way is best, dislike of the more laborious democratic method of getting decisions and action, and lack of the knowledge—or, more especially, of the skills—required for group management are among the more common explanations. Beyond these, no doubt, there lies the pressure of our social inheritance, which is still operating.

The autocratic concept has long prevailed in many governments throughout the world and, in the recent past, had reached a point of having to be put down. Our own government set out to use the opposite concept, but its history, so far, is full of a struggle to rid itself of autocracy. Our military organization, as well as much of the organization of business, industry, labor, religion and social affairs, clings to many of the techniques and forms of autocracy. Members of our boards of education have grown up in these many organizations and undoubtedly bring their own personal ideas and experiences to bear on their control over the schools. It is in no sense strange, therefore, if school adiminstration has often unwittingly built the concept of autocracy into its machinery of management.

Where our proneness to autocracy comes from. In so far

as the autocratic principle has been brought to bear upon us in childhood, it is almost sure to have left an impression upon our personalities that training cannot easily overcome. A child brought up by parents and teachers who have ruled by unreasoned discipline has become a subject. He fears the law and all authority, because it has meant repression to him; he looks to others for decisions on all sorts of questions, because he has not learned how to be responsible for decisions. Among his weaker playmates he, in turn, becomes the dominating bully. Too little of orderly life in home and school can produce results like these. These little subjects, or potential tyrants, ripen into persons of indecision or into autocrats, in the sense that they have no understanding of any other way. Having missed the chance to learn that the laws of their country are their laws, the combined wills of their own people, they can never feel or think of them as friendly powers; as a result, authority comes to mean power to command or something to be obeyed, instead of power to guide us in getting our work done. Once the concept of autocracy has become an element in the make-up of the person, it is difficult for that person to function in a democratic organization. What one does depends upon what he is, as well as upon what he knows.

In a study of school organization, one may reasonably assume that the purpose is to apply the democratic principle. It is equally reasonable to expect, however, that through the glory of long tradition, through the glamorous examples of success in business, and through the ingrained traits of personalities involved, the concept of autocracy will be ever lurking about as a potential handicap if it is not positively guarded against.

If this reasoning is sound, it brings us to a corollary of the proposition that organization is a means, not an end; that with us it is designed for the application of cooperative effort to a task. This corollary would add that organization is equally concerned to prevent interference with this cooperation. Interference by these forces of tradition, examples, and personality traits might appear in many ways. In so far

as possible, it is the purpose and proper function of an organization to anticipate and forestall them.

Our concept of organization. It is with the nature of organization, thus defined, that the following analysis will be concerned. To restate our reasoning briefly, a good organization is an arrangement of persons wherein its members may work effectively, economically, and harmoniously together to achieve a common purpose; an arrangement of persons which, as far as possible, may guard effectively against interference with its purposes or processes; an arrangement of persons which relies as much upon the common will, the initiative, and the understanding of its members as it does upon authority, to energize and guide it, and that applies these concepts, also, in its relations with those whom it serves.

4. *Typical Ways of Thinking of an Organization*

In practice, it may be difficult at times to tell where an organizing activity ends and the directing, or any other one of the administrative activities, begins. Once completed, however, the organization appears in a form that is tangible, distinct, and, in a manner, self-contained. The faculty, the class, the committee, the office force, the grade, the department, the board of education, the school, each brings to mind a clear picture of a well-defined group of people, and in each case the group is entirely distinguishable from every other group not of its own class. Each one is an institution and exists, not by chance, but by conscious and purposeful design. The identity of an organization is more often revealed by its purpose than by its form, though sometimes by both; that is, its name usually tells its purpose, even though it may require both a general and a special title, as, department of physics, or curriculum committee, or grade teachers' association.[10]

An organization may be thought of in many ways. We

[10] See John M. Gaus, Leonard D. White, and Marshall E. Dimock, *The Frontiers of Public Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. Chapter on the theory of organization.

often think of it as the structure or framework of the institution in question, emphasizing its power to support and suggesting a static, rather than a dynamic, nature. Sometimes we think of an organization more as an embodiment of authority, a system of connected offices providing places of residence, and channels for the flow of authority. Such a picture makes the organization seem alive, but it suggests the presence of power, without hint of how it originates or how or to what ends it may be used. Such a picture tends, somehow, to inspire fear or respect based, in part, upon fear. Whether one thinks of it as power to command him or as power to control or restrain him, he still will fear it.[11] Another characterization of an organization shows it as a system by which the work and responsibilities are divided or assigned to the members. Such a picture makes the organization a depersonalized prescription—alive, responsible, and a going concern but, for unity, depending more upon its web of agreed-upon assignments than upon the persons who hold them. Still a different picture is of a somewhat personal and somewhat mechanical force—one that coordinates the activities of the members, producing unity of action by a common purpose and the conscious self-guidance of the individuals.

Probably no two persons have the same mental picture when they hear the word organization. The reason for this, in part, is a matter of past experience with organizations. One's own mental picture is likely to be a memory image of what the term has really meant to him, of how the organ-

[11] It seems to be our nature to strive to get ourselves arranged in a fixed world. In a world that is so bent upon discovery, this can never be. Our laws, our organization (for government, business, education, religion), even our system of ethics and taste and dress and speech—one as well as another—must change as time brings new purposes to be served and new circumstances to be met. The search for security must be continuous; it must fight against change for the sake of change; it must outwit the growing number of crackpot reformers, but it must not thwart progress or try to defy or rule out the possibility of new elements being developed within our culture.

izations that he has known behaved, or how they affected him. An equally good reason is to be found in the complex nature of an organization. Organizations (for management) are made up of persons. Each person is different in all important ways from all others—different in social inheritance, in intelligence, in knowledge, in physical and emotional energy, in will and purpose and attitude. The task of cooperation is new and different, therefore, for each person in each organization of which he is a member; and different, too, for all, as any new task is undertaken by his group.

Organization is the "something" that makes cooperation possible and that causes the members to work cooperatively to a plan. Whether this something is a force outside and above the persons or within the members themselves, these varied personalities are involved and must be dealt with. This complexity of an organization appears equally formidable when one considers how the members are held together and how their efforts are directed. Two diametrically opposed concepts of how this may be done were discussed above. Under either of those concepts, the ways by which the nature and the behavior of the unifying and energizing principle might be applied could be almost endless in number.[12] Of these many ways, some must be better than others. If so, it is these better ones for which we are searching; or, more accurately, we are in search of what makes them better, for our problem is to find out what is the nature of a good organization.

5. *Foundations of an Organization*

Work to be done, persons, and environment as elements in organization. In all cases, organizations have their origins in work to be done; the organization itself is composed

[12] James D. Mooney, "The Principles of Organization." In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

of persons. A third basic factor is that all work and all the persons organized exist within and have their nature as an organization shaped in part by environmental forces. Jobs range from small and simple tasks, manageable by one person or by many with each working quite independently of the others, to vast and complicated projects requiring many persons, intricate processes, and a high degree of coordination and of cooperation. Organization begins when each of those working begins to operate with regard for what the others are doing, and it grows more and more complicated as more people and more intricate interlocking and combination of efforts are required.[13]

Persons differ widely in their capacity for participating in organized activities. As tasks grow large in scope and intricate in process, more intelligence and skill, as well as more persons, are required for performing them. At some point, participation requires such extensive and such specific information and understanding on the part of any participant that specifications, records, and rules of procedure—*i.e.*, an extensive paper organization—have to be used as a means of expanding or extending the powers and intelligence of the persons. Persons differ also in their trustworthiness. Some will do their full share and more, while others will shirk; some will and others will not see to it that their efforts coordinate with those of other workers at points where work passes from one person to another. Laziness, selfishness, and jealousy do not make for unity of purpose and effort; instead, such personal traits tend to destroy the coordinations that are essential to unity of action, the very essence of an organization.

It seems apparent that, in order to set up an organization, one must know these elements well. He must know its purpose—what work and how much is to be done and, so, how many persons and what kinds of talent the work will

[13] Interlocking is facilitated through the supporting paper machinery, which should be so designed as to extend the reach of human powers and personalities.

require. Things about the job that count include kinds of work; amounts of each kind; the time element; distances involved; relations between jobs; and the facilities available for housing, communication, information, and travel. Things about persons that will count include amount and types of intelligence, skill, training, experience in the work, personality, physique, age, often sex, and possibly race and nationality.

The starting point in organizing. Whether the nature of the job or the character of available personnel is to be the starting point in building an organization may or may not be an academic question.[14] In most cases, choice of personnel is somewhat limited at best. Industry, business, and education, alike, regard large turnover in personnel as a worse evil than having to shape some of the jobs to fit the available talent. This decision usually involves some compromise for organization. At its worst, this is not too serious in education. We have come to treat it as part of the administrative job, so we devise our organization to cover in-service education of staff as well as the education of the children. If to the expectation that people will learn on the job we add the fact that most jobs are not so technical and exacting in character that persons moderately well fitted for them cannot soon learn to do them, then we may conclude that, whatever logic or principle we develop as the essential explanation of the nature of an organization, that logic or principle will have to work, in spite of this compromise between nature of persons and nature of jobs, as the dominant element and the starting point. It seems wiser, therefore, to start with the assumption that both job and person count, that both are capable of some adjusting, and that an organization represents the best fitting together of the two.

If organizing involves fitting talents and jobs together, and if both factors are in most cases fairly specific in their

[14] Henry L. Gantt, *Organizing for Work.* New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., 1919.

capacities to fit or be fitted, knowing the job and the persons in the respects above suggested is a first requisite in the organizing activity. Further, this question is not only as to what counts, but also as to how to recognize it for its application in a given case. In recommending people for school positions, we speak of leadership, of executive ability, of organizing power, of special kinds of training, or of special knowledges or skills, of personality, of industry, of courage, of this or that type of interest, of loyalty, of dependability, of experience, always as if there were an established basis for saying that the special traits, kinds of training, experience, and qualities of personality we use were genuine evidence of fitness for the particular job. In other words, we take this task of fitting persons to jobs seriously. We believe we know what makes for and what may prevent a good fit.[15]

Function and geography as factors in organization. Approaching the task of organization from the standpoint of the work to be done—the task of setting up the jobs, of laying out the plan for a division of labor—we speak in terms of functions, as, teaching, counseling, supervision, research, administration, library management, health care and inspection, secretarial work, clerical work, custodial work, work in the trades, and common labor. That is, we think of the classification of jobs in terms of functions as a basic step in organizing and we often use the expression "functional organization."[16]

Parallel with this is the question of geography, which is partly a functional matter and partly a recognition of the fact that organization has to take place in a space that fixes limits by force of the distance or other physical barriers, such as a bridgeless river, railroad tracks, or heavy traffic

[15] By virtue of developments in the field or personality psychology and of mental-aptitude tests, some scientific headway is being made in this field.

[16] Several of the chapters in *Papers on the Science of Administration*, above cited, bear upon these two bases of organization.

lanes. An attendance area in a local school system is a functional unit in the sense that the school is a community enterprise; it is a geographical unit when it is determined by the fact that children can walk only about so far to school or by the existence of some special physical barriers.[17]

Both of these bases of job organization are old in use and have grown up from experience rather than from any philosophy of organization. Quite often, as new functions have been developed in education, the question of organization has arisen. Is this a new and distinct function or only a new development in an old one? Guidance illustrates this. Guidance was regarded by some as but a phase of the instructional process; by others, as, perhaps, a large and certainly a new division of the broad function of administration. It has settled into a place of its own but has moved out of the strictly administrative realm, to provide a special staff service to support and supplement teaching. Research was thought to be a new and independent function in 1909 and, from the start, has maintained a separate position, although not so much as the overlord it started out to be. Now it has become a staff service to all, and its program is built up out of the needs for information throughout the system, and not by the particular taste or fancy of the directing head of the unit. Determining the research program for the year is now a process which, at its best, is much like that of developing the annual budget.

If a study were made of the changes in school organization in this country, it is fairly certain that the data gathered would show that, as new functions have evolved and older ones have moved over to give room for the new, the net result was not merely an addition of a new function or a new unit of organization, but also a change in some of the old functions. Most of the new functions added were first

[17] See Luther H. Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization." Chap. I in *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. In the same volume, see John Lee, "The Pros and Cons of Functionalization."

discovered as aspects or as points of weakness in the old and well-established functions. Partial exceptions to this are seen in new units made necessary by growth of the population or by shifts in the population, resulting from growth in industry and commerce in the district, or by the addition of a new unit, such as a junior college or a technical school, or by a reorganization in plant facilities, as a result of loss by fire, or by abandonment of old properties or change in district boundaries.

Weaknesses in our organizations have been discovered not by study of the work, the job, alone. They have in some cases been found by students interested in education as a science, sometimes by people of insight and energy who were at work on the job itself. In neither case was the approach to any such discovery made by study of the task alone or of the traits of the workers alone, but rather by study of the *job in process of being done.* That is, the word function does not refer to job alone but, in part, also to the nature of the process of doing it. The function of teaching cannot be thought of without some thought of the possibilities of executing it, that is, without thought of the teacher and of the teaching act (including the learner), as well as of what is to be taught. When we refer to the nature of the job, we really mean the nature of the activity, (and so, unavoidably, the necessary characteristics of the actor) involved in doing the job.

The factor of environment. Turning to our third basic factor—environmental forces and circumstances—we have the same fact of close interdependence to face. As persons to be organized and jobs to be set out have to be thought of, each as in part determining the nature of the other, so the organization has to be thought of as existing and operating in an environment. The numbers and types of children are bases for measuring the work to be done; but such factors as size of district, funds available, physical barriers to attendance, climate, availability of transportation, and

means of communication, all play a part in shaping the organization of the schools.[18] We might go further and say that the traditions, attitudes, and aspirations of the people, only partly reflected in the laws that create the schools, also play a part in shaping the organization.

A very large district is likely to organize, in part, on a geographical as well as a functional basis for supervision and for all central-office administration. One school may be small and another one large, because of the particular attendance barriers. The school health department, in one case, will have inspection and supervision only, while in another it will have clinics for treatment and care; because public opinion or the size of the budget demands little in one case and much in the other. In a third case, the city health department may have charge of the problem. In one school, the organization requires use of messengers, while another has telephones. One system develops an extensive scheme of paper machinery that makes the routines of management formal, but very dependable; another has little of records, accounts, studies, and reports and is very informal and often wasteful of time. Warm climate allows much outdoor work and open buildings, calling for an organization quite different from that of a plant designed for a frigid climate. The size of playgrounds determines whether all the children can be out at once or whether they must rotate by groups for use of the play facilities. Thus, in endless ways these outside forces and circumstances play a part in organization. True, they are not actual divisions of the organization, but to a large extent they determine the nature of organization, even if they are not direct elements in that nature. The junior high school plan of organization was years in developing, partly because the

[18] Victor Jones, *Metropolitan Government.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. His examination of the tangle of the functional with the geographical layout of a great population center brings out much that applies in principle to school-district organization.

old grade-school housing prevented the introduction of a real junior high school program of instruction.[19]

The presence of work to be done, of persons to do it, and of environment and circumstances in which the work and the persons exist do not make an organization. These are but limitations and the things to be organized. In the work to be done there is need for action, in the persons there is the capacity for action, in the environment there are the conditioning circumstances for action; but nothing happens. To make it an organization, something must animate or energize it; something must make it intelligent, purposeful, and self-directing; something must give it power of decision and of action; something must unify and hold its parts together before it is a going concern.

6. *Other Crucial Elements in an Organization*

Three basic elements. The purpose, self-direction, and going power of an organization may be thought of as outside and independent elements, though in a sense they take their start from the nature of the job, the person, and the environment in the case. We may think of these basic elements as authority, closely coupled to responsibility; knowledge, somewhat differently coupled to purpose, plan, and provisions for procedures, control, and direction; and the organizing principle, the principle by which unity of parts is effected and by which energy and authority are brought to bear effectively upon the work.

A school organization comes into existence about as follows:

1. The people feel a need for education.

2. The people enact laws by which districts are created and empowered to establish schools.

3. The district authorizes action and support and establishes a board, which employs personnel. This brings the

[19] Herbert A. Simon, "Decision-making and Administrative Organization." *Public Administration Review,* 4:16–30, Winter, 1944.

three basic elements of organization, *viz.*, work, persons with authority, environmental forces, into existence.

4. The laws and the board's action bring the element of authority into place.

5. The laws and the board's orders define and place the element of responsibility.

6. Through its training and experience, the personnel provides the element of knowledge, which analyzes the peoples' needs and makes specific their general purpose to provide education, and then plans and, by study, provides intelligence to keep efforts focused upon the work.

7. In the task of arranging the work in parts, in attaching persons to jobs or to specific responsibilities, in placing and providing for the use of authority, in providing for the development and use of knowledge, some basic element of cohesion must be provided if these parts are to be unified and to bear properly upon each other and to produce a harmony of effort at every point. Upon this basis, upon the principles, or theory, by which these elements are unified, depends all. Right ingredients put together by a wrong principle will fail to work and will defeat the purpose. The basis of an organization is the principle of its creation and the rule of its life. Our choice is the democratic principle.

Authority. Authority for public school organization is the will of the people. Authority comes to an organization in the form of law—constitution, statute, state-board regulations, and local-board decisions under state law. Authority, in some cases, is sharply defined and limited by the law; in others, it is discretionary within wide limits. Authority represents power to decide, to act, to command others. In a school organization, all persons have authority to do their own proper parts of the work and, so, to decide and act in that limited field. Some have authority to command others. All are themselves subject to the law they apply in their work and most are subject to the command of others, who are authorized to put the law into effect. Where discretion

is authorized, this power to command is very broad and places those commanded in a position in which they may not be able to anticipate precisely what the law is to be. In the management of a school system, it would be impractical for the law to try to anticipate all the varying needs of the children and, for this reason, there must be wide use of discretionary authority.[20]

Since authority is a determiner of action for all members of the organization, it is clear that all must possess some of it and must use it; and all must know where authority resides in the organization and how it operates, if they are to know how to use it and how to comply with it. So, organization must have a place or places of residence for authority and there must be channels for the flow of this energizing force.[21] If authority appears in a place not expected, if it overflows its banks or at will creates new channels or is suddenly withdrawn from one's position, there is certain to be confusion. One can see persons; to a large extent he can see or otherwise be aware of the work to be done and of the environmental factors that have to be recognized. But authority is less visible; it is fluid and moves from point to point in the organization by rule, by command, and sometimes—perhaps, unexpectedly—by mysterious ways, which we call abuse of authority. If authority is not clearly placed and channeled, almost anyone in the organization may claim and use it, or it may lie as a potential but unused element.

Authority at work. Authority is never granted to a school organization merely as a power to act or to command, but always to be used to some purpose or in some specific way. This purpose and way are often very sharply defined and limited by the law. Law empowers a school board to

[20] James Hart, "Administrative Justice and the Supremacy of Law." *Georgetown Law Journal,* 29:543–554, February, 1941. See also M. B. Rosenberry, "The Supremacy of Law: Law vs. Discretion." *Marquette Law Review,* 23:1–12, December, 1938.

[21] For a discussion of the line of authority and communication, see Gardner B. Burleigh, *Human Relations in Industry.* Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1945. Chap. 2.

legislate, and the board cannot delegate this power to others. In general, school law provides the schools with no authority except that which the law itself sets out or which the law clearly implies.[22] So, this element of authority is a very specialized force, intended to energize the organization, to set its parts in motion, but only in particular motion to particular ends, and operating always through particular parts of the organization. When authority is not clearly attached to offices or to officers or employees, then to that extent there is a lack of organization.

The placing and channeling of authority with respect to responsibility is, in a sense, the most vital problem of the organizing process. The theory of organization should offer explanation of how authority is made a part of the machine and how it is to function. It seems obvious that decision has first to be made as to choice of either the democratic or the autocratic concept as the basis. Surely, too, placement and flow of authority must be related to the placement and definition of responsibility for work; and placement of responsibility is related to the scheme or the principle underlying the breakup of the work into jobs, which, in turn, is dictated by our purposes and by the nature of the work. It seems, also, that authority cannot be rationally applied unless it is supported by information; so the system of channels for authority and the plan and mechanism for accumulating knowledge and for getting the knowledge distributed must, somehow, be related.

The conclusion of this view must be that, starting with the purpose of the organization, the elements of authority, responsibility, knowledge, and basic philosophy, none of them, is a separate and independent element. Even the basic elements—work to be done, personnel to do it, and environmental limitations—are each affected, not only by the purpose to be served, but also by the nature of all the others. The basic elements, in a large way, determine how

[22] *Bohn v. Stubblefield,* 238 Ill. A453, illustrates the position the courts have taken quite consistently on this matter.

the more specialized elements shall be fitted in, and vice versa. If any one element is more nearly a starting point and chief determiner of organization than any other, it is clearly the work, and not the persons or the authority or the physical plant and finance.[23] The laws of learning, of physical and personality growth and development, must not be violated. These laws are, in fact, determiners; but so far, psychology has not shown that the requirements of these laws are hard to meet or that they require any one narrowly restricted pattern of instruction or plan.

Responsibility. Above, reference was made to "nature of the function" as a basis for organization and, so, for the assignment of jobs, the idea being that a job would be laid out in terms of function. One will teach, another supervise, another administer, and so on through all the functions required. There are two reasons behind this idea. First, in the running of a school, the function of administration is usually assigned to one person as principal. For a large school one or more vice-principals may be provided, but, if so, each is assigned to some special subdivision of the administrative service. That is, the assignment applies the functional concept in a slightly more refined way. We see this same application of functional division of labor in teaching. One teacher is assigned to teach science only or to teach a certain type of children only. The function of teaching dull children is different from that of teaching bright ones. That of teaching the very young differs from that of teaching older ones. That of teaching the hard of hearing differs from that of teaching the partially blind. In subject specialization, the variety of functions is almost endless. Experience has led to recognition of these divisions in our plans of placing or assigning responsibility.

[23] We could think of authority as something outside and separate from the form or structure of officers and employees, but, in reality, neither would be of consequence without the other. It seems more true to what we sense as the nature of organization to think of them together.

It would look very strange if, instead of this, there were no specialization except, perhaps, in quantity of work. Each person would administer, teach, supervise, do his own counseling and his own research, clean his own room, and mow his part of the lawn. Why does this functional concept seem to have so much merit in contrast to the "quantity of work" basis? The reasoning seems to be: (1) Each person has to be assigned, in part, in terms of his ability—otherwise, he cannot bear responsibility. School work is all specialized and requires training to do it. Training is bound to keep in line with market demand for service, so people come trained in special ways—for teaching in a special field, for supervision, for administration. (2) Ability is not unlimited, so only limited responsibility can be borne, even by trained persons. Generally speaking, one can do more work and better work in proportion to the narrowness of its demands upon his attention and energy. If one has but one type of function to perform, he can concentrate upon it. If he has three or six, he may wear himself out shifting attention from one to another and, so, may lose much time and waste much energy. Of course, specialization could be carried to a point where it would deaden the worker by its narrowness of demand upon his interests. Some change is needed as recreation. Few educational functions ever become so routine and narrow, however, as not to be stimulating to an intelligent and healthy person.

Assignments in terms of responsibilities.[24] In using this element of responsibility in an organization, it seems clear that consideration must be given both to the shaping of the job and to the ability of the person. The functional concept has evolved in our experience as the best principle to guide the shaping of jobs; and abilities and persons are judged mainly on the basis of training, experience, and

[24] O. R. McGuire, "Control of Administrative Responsibility—A Little Practical Virtue Is to Be Preferred to Theory." *George Washington Law Review,* 7:304–324, January, 1939.

personality. It is the business of the organizer to be able to work out a functional plan and to be able to choose persons who will be equal to bearing the specific responsibilities involved in each job. In this task, as was noted above, there will be many disturbing factors—people already on the staff, the costs involved, the existing plan of housing, and often a hundred petty matters.[25] It is one thing to allow these external factors to dominate assignment and a different thing to start with a clear picture of the job and of the ideal type of person for it, then to deal with the intruding factors in the light of what they can or must contribute to the solution.

Responsibility calls for authority. The fitting of person to task has one other aspect, that of empowering the person to do the task. Technically, responsibility in a school system cannot exist without authority to bear it. It takes the authority of law to do any public school work whatever, and if one is asked to do work, then he is automatically empowered to do it. However simple, obvious, and axiomatic this may seem, practice reveals many apparent violations of it. Such violations are seldom, if ever, open attempts to ask or to allow anyone to work without authority. Occasionally someone will assume authority and try by unfair means to gain control for selfish reasons, and weak administrators do three entirely typical things in violation. One of these is to keep general control of everything, making assignments so narrow as practically to violate the application of the functional concept; another is to grant authority enough to do a job day by day, recalling the authority at night, as it were, and without warning, and so, leaving the person with a feeling of utter insecurity; a third is the trick of giving some authority and pretending to guide an employee in a task until a point is reached where it is apparent that whoever is publicly credited with having done the job will be in high repute or will be blamed for inefficiency, whereupon

[25] The question of relationships between functions (Chap. 5) need not detain us here, for coordination is itself to be treated as a function.

he at once takes back practically all authority and gets the glory or backs out, leaving the employee fully responsible for the blame.

These abuses in manipulating the element of responsibility in organizing illustrate the point that organization as a part of the administrative process must be used, as far as possible, not only to do the chosen work in the most efficient way, but also, to prevent interference with the work. Of these abuses it can be said that they are not organization but lack of organization, or even disorganization.[26]

This brings us to one other approach to the study of how this element of responsibility behaves or is to be used, or of what its nature is in an organization. To show that it is a tangible part of an organization, one has only to add to the above the point that its existence in the consciousness of the employee is an index to what the employee thinks he should do and what he will try to do as his job. If the administrator makes a vague assignment, then the employee must have a vague picture of his job and an equally vague, and therefore disturbed, sense of responsibility, which, in turn, produces instability in the organization.

Knowledge. As one of the elements essential in an organization, knowledge is similar to authority in some respects.[27] It is needed everywhere in the organization and, so, by every member; for organization means order, that is, arrangement by plan. An organization is made alive by authority, perhaps, but it is made self-directive by knowledge. Because an organization must have knowledge as an ingredient, our inquiry is concerned with what this element

[26] Alexander H. Leighton, *The Governing of Men.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1945. See also M. E. Dimock, "Potential Incentives of Public Employment." *The American Political Science Review,* 27:628–636, August, 1936.

[27] At this point, our discussion of the place of knowledge in organization refers to the working knowledge that is required from day to day, as administration faces its tasks, and not to the total science and philosophy of administration. This larger problem is treated in Part III of the book.

is, where it comes from, how it is to be fitted to other parts, and how it plays a part in making the organization effective for its work.[28]

The members of the personnel of an organization have nothing to do with creating authority but much to do with placing, channeling, and using it. Its source is in the law and outside the school.[29] The case of knowledge is at least partly parallel to this, although it differs in certain respects. Much of the knowledge required has been developed by scholars outside the schools; much of it is in possession of the personnel, accumulated through training and experience. All this stands ready to be drawn upon by the personnel as it may be required. Unlike authority, however, much of the knowledge required has to be developed by the organization staff by a study of its problems when and where they arise. So, to develop as well as to use knowledge is, in reality, a part of every person's assignment, *i.e.*, a part of the responsibility of each employee or officer, even though a special research unit may also be built into the organization.

Thus, knowledge, which we may call a part of each member's professional equipment, is a part of the nature of the organization. The organization, by the nature of its members, is intelligent. In this knowledge and in the native intelligence is to be found, also, the capacity to develop additional knowledge. Knowledge possessed or the capac-

[28] As a problem in the study of the nature of the administrative process, this element would deserve separate treatment in a chapter of its own, parallel to that on authority, but for the repetition this would involve, in view of the way in which knowledge functions as a part or aspect of every other element treated and of the necessity for dealing with the broader problem of the total realm of subject matter for this field, reserved for Part III of the book.

[29] We need to keep in clearer focus than most public administrators seem to do just how law is related to administration. Authority and its application must be kept together. See James M. Landis, "Crucial Issues in Administrative Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 53:1077–1102, May, 1940; and A. H. Chroust, "Law and the Administrative Process; An Epistemological Approach to Jurisprudence." *Harvard Law Review,* 58:573–588, April, 1945.

ity for developing it is one basis upon which the individual is employed. Possession of it by members of the organization does not guarantee that it will be an active element. That guarantee has to be provided for by the organization through the elements of authority and responsibility, that is, by the assignment, the compelling power of which is law.

Often, in practice, the arrangement for the use of knowledge in school organization is not very carefully handled. Often authority tries to do work that can be done properly only by the use of knowledge. The law does not guide one's action very minutely. Practically all the specific decisions and actions have to be determined by knowledge. Science, much more than law, is what it takes to decide most of our everyday questions, for usually the law can take one only part of the way to the answers that one must have. Law may fix rules for establishing a junior high school form of organization but does not tell whether it would be wise for any given district to undertake the work; nor does it give more than rough directions for accomplishing it. These large unoccupied areas are provided with authority; but it is discretionary, not specific, and so, must make its decisions for itself. It is possible for a board, a superintendent, or any lesser executive with discretionary powers to give orders or make decisions in terms of his own prejudices or whims, and to disregard the task of finding out the proper facts or of using them if they are offered by others. He can be quite arbitrary and still not break the law.[30] This decision by discretionary power, rather than by the authority of scientific findings, is one of the bad things that a good organization should provide against. To do so, it seems necessary to give this element of knowledge a chance to fulfill its proper part in the organization.

Difficulties of getting knowledge to do its part. This abuse—acting on authority, rather than on knowledge—is not an offense of executives alone. It can be seen in the

[30] See Erwin N. Griswold, "Government in Ignorance of the Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 48:198–213, December, 1934.

classroom; it appears constantly in supervision; and too often it is perceptible in guidance. Explanation of this weakness is to be found in the personnel, often in the established traditions of practice—not in the nature of the work itself, or of the law, or of the environmental factors. Back of it are ignorance, lack of energy, laziness, indifference, jealousy, love of personal power, and, with these, the fear of authority by those who so often see and suffer from these abuses. Can organization prevent these forces from playing a part in the organization?

An examination of the nature of authority will show that it can flow downward, from superior to subordinate, only. If it started to flow in reverse of this or horizontally, between equals, conflict would result automatically. This is not true of knowledge; that is, it is not true unless something like tradition, ignorance, fear, love of personal power, or like obstructions get in its way. If through the assignment, by means of authority and responsibility, those obstructions could be kept out, then knowledge would flow as freely from a janitor to the chief executive as it would in the reverse direction. We need to quit confusing the giving of information with the giving of orders. We need to make the use and exchange of knowledge surer and more popular. Probably stupid persons will always resent being told anything, and the power-hungry will always try to display authority, but it should be possible to penalize any such obstructions to the smooth running of an organization.[31] If this can be done, it obviously would be by right placement of authority and responsibility in the assignments to duty.

[31] For a consideration of this problem, see the author's *City School Administrative Controls*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938. Chap. II. See also Paul Felix Lazarsfeld, "Remarks on Administrative and Critical Communications Research." *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, 9:2–16, 1941. Also Luther H. Gulick, "Research in Public Administration." *Public Administration*, 9:388–392, October, 1932. Also William Anderson and John M. Gaus, *Research in Public Administration*. New York: Social Science Research Council, Committee on Public Administration, 1945.

The principle of unity as the basis of organization. A study of the separate elements of an organization reveals much about its nature, but there is still the question as to how these elements can be united. Our concern is with the whole, not with the parts, as such. The nature of school work (learning, teaching, guidance, supervision, research, administration, legislation) provides a clue as to what is important in the organization of work. Division of labor must recognize the nature of the functions involved in doing the work. The nature of human beings, their capacities and limitations, provide clues for organizing the personnel. Physical and financial factors are pliable within fixed limits, and their natures determine how they can and cannot be used in an organization; similarly, the natures of authority and of responsibilities determine their use. In no case, can any element be treated as if it were usable in any and all ways. In all cases, the nature of the element sets certain limits and, to a large extent, reveals the capacity of the element to play a part in an organization.

By the nature of the elements involved, it is clear that they cannot be put together in terms of the laws of physics and mechanics alone. The laws or principles of psychology, of sociology, of economics, of politics, of ethics, and of logic are quite as clearly involved. The organization in question here is much more than a machine; yet, it is not a mob. It is purposeful and self-directing, and it possesses and applies energy, knowledge, and authority to the doing of work. Its parts are specialized, and it is capable of change as its purposes or materials may require. Somehow, the separate elements work together in unison as if they were inseparable parts of a whole. There is a unity, and there must be a unifying principle that effects it.

Unity through common purpose. The first and most obvious element involved in producing unity is to be found in the minds of the members of the organization in the form of a clearly defined and agreed upon purpose. Purpose in an organization is so inseparable from the nature of the work to be done, and so much a part of the workers themselves,

that it could be treated as a characteristic of either. At the same time, it plays so large a part in shaping the organization that it may quite as reasonably be treated along with authority, responsibility, and knowledge, as one of the crucial elements or ingredients. Here, a third way to treat purpose has been chosen, making it one of the several forces used as a basis for unifying the organization. To know the part it plays is what is important.

Unity through authority and knowledge. The principle by which authority exists and operates in the organization (Sec. 3, above) is clearly one part of the force that unifies. The parts may be held, each to its responsible place, by a unified authority (at its worst, by the principle of autocracy); or by a distributed authority (the democratic principle). Distributed authority need not lack unity and unity of authority need not become autocratic. The control by authority may be modified little or much by the use of knowledge. Knowledge is a force for unity because it is a basis for understanding among the members of the personnel and for their agreeing with one another and for guiding their action. One cannot live by law (either legal or scientific) that he does not know. Knowledge may play but a slight role if it is left out as a definite part of the organization, but this does not mean that it is not needed as an ingredient or that any other element (authority, for instance) can be a fitting substitute for it. So, we may say that the principle by which authority and knowledge are applied in an organization is basic in determining unity.

The division of labor principle, essential to organization, applied on the basis of functions, provides the functional concept as a second means of getting workers and work together. This concept has to be supplemented by use of the geographical basis when distance, physical barriers, or lack of communication facilities reach a point at which they hinder work. This (function) is a unifying concept, in the sense that it brings like activities together and so makes concentrated application of effort possible.

Purpose will not appear ready for use in an organization except as it is implied in school law and contract; it has first to be formed. It will not become effective in the organization through the mere fact of its being on paper. In order for it to motivate and direct and unify action, it must be the purpose of those who make up the organization. Purpose cannot be imposed; it must be understood, agreed upon, and adopted before it can become operative. It must be the purpose of the whole, not of a part only, of the organization. Authority will not be effective for unity in an organization until responsibility for it is fixed, understood, and accepted. Acceptance of responsibility can be compelled only in part, at most. It has to be accepted in order to be made effective for work in an organization. Knowledge, too, has to be a possession of those who need to apply it. It does not come to the organization by any magic formula, but must be developed. Facts must be found where they are and taken to where they are needed, when they will be useful. They have to be arranged in ways that will reveal their meaning. They have to be understood before they can be applied. One cannot, to any great extent, compel the development or the use of knowledge.

Thus, the factors by which the organization is unified are to be found in the nature and behavior of the elements of which it is composed. Personnel, work, and environmental factors, energized by authority and enlightened by knowledge, and stabilized by a sense of responsibility, are brought into a unified whole by virtue of a common purpose, by a use of authority that recognizes the worth and dignity of the individual, by the value and the use of knowledge, and by application of the functional concept in the work arrangement and in the worker assignment.

7. *Organization's Protection against Interferences*

It was noted above that a good organization has both a positive and a negative function—to do specified work and to prevent any interference with its activities. A full treat-

ment of the weaknesses of organizations is not a proper part of this study of the nature of organization, but some note of what it is in an organization that ensures against interferences is required if this aspect of its nature is to be indicated as one of the positive characteristics of an organization.

There are two approaches to a study of this problem: (1) Does the organization contain in its nature any forces or characteristics that may represent power for both good and bad? and (2) Does it contain elements or provide for arrangement or behavior of elements that represent positive opposition to interferences?

The answer to the first question is yes, in proportion as we fail to select *personnel* that have right traits and are lacking wrong ones. As to the second, the *law*—the basis of authority—is positive in its contribution; but when it is fixed in the *paper machinery* or left as *discretion* in the hands of persons, it can be badly applied. *Knowledge* will work favorably if it is developed and brought to bear; but it, too, awaits the will of the personnel. *Responsibility, common purpose,* and *right use of the functional concept,* and the *right application of the democratic concept* in *use of authority*—all, in like manner, can be depended upon for contributions; but, again, these are susceptible of misuse by persons of ignorance or wrong motive.

This is virtually saying that there is no way to make an organization of men invulnerable; but it seems equally obvious that an organization can be made less vulnerable and, so, more effective when thought is devoted to considering the traits and capacities of the persons chosen for it and when its elements are given a proper arrangement.

It should be noted that school organizations suffer about as often from neglect as from direct abuse. Organizations grow old because their purposes and natures do not keep pace with change in the *needs* that gave rise to them. It must be the nature of any organization, especially one designed for the accomplishment of a social purpose like edu-

cation, to keep alive, to keep changing as its work requires. It cannot be made once for all, but must be kept continuously in process of making, or it will become crystallized and decadent and, finally, must break down. When the right elements of an organization are rightly put together, they provide an intelligent, purposeful, self-critical, going concern, which is the best safeguard against obstructions. By having purpose, will, and intelligence to do its work, it soon develops the support of a social force, in the form of public recognition of certain standards and modes of conduct and grades of achievement, that powerfully stimulate right effort and expose its opposite. Without such social recognition, even law is powerless.

As an aspect of importance, this public recognition of the standards by which we judge merit in service brings up the fact that what public service employees do is watched by the public, and that employees are not a little held to account by the constant pressure upon them of the public gaze. Though, much of the time, this gaze is not very penetrating, there is always the possibility that it may become so. We may think of public opinion, therefore, as one of the environmental factors that operate in an organization to hold it to its proper course. It rewards and penalizes sometimes by no more than a nod, perhaps; but when needed, it has capacity to set authority to work in a serious way.[32]

[32] A. Lawrence Lowell, *Public Opinion and Popular Government.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1913.

Chapter 4. DIRECTING AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

The term direction is shown to have both a general and a special meaning in administration. To illuminate the latter, brief consideration is given to the question of how our analysis of the administrative process fits in with sound principles of job assignment.

Following this definition, a study of the nature of the directing activity is begun. The first step in this study is concerned with what factors are involved, how each factor plays its part in the process, and how people react to what happens. With job, study of job, personalities, organization, law, orders, recipients of orders, work done, and reaction of workers, all given places in the problem, the second step proceeds to isolate direction as a separate element in the total process. In this, the bearing of the democratic vs. the autocratic concept is noted, and the directing process is shown to originate in study, to proceed through decisions and orders, and to end in a backward look, or checkup. The conclusion is that direction may be separate from other phases of the administrative process at the points of applying power, but not at the earlier or later phases of its performance.

This separateness in the matter of power is important, however, and becomes the object of study in step three. How authority is created by law, what it is for, how it can be used and how abused, who possesses authority—officer or person—and what is its relation to responsibility and to the kind of work to be done reveal how the nature of ad-

ministrative authority harmonizes with the proper uses of knowledge in management. Step four, which considers the function of knowledge in direction, reenforces the conclusions of step three by showing how it makes responsibility a necessary accompaniment of authority.

With this analysis completed, thought turns to a practical review of direction at work. In what forms direction may be effected, how it is applied to small and large tasks, what methods and techniques are used for applying it, and what is the bearing of different forms on the morale of workers are considered. This is carried further by consideration of the implications of a hierarchical form of organization and, finally, of a divided vs. a unified form.

1. *Common and Technical Usages of the Term Direction*[1]

General use of term. The term direction is used in school administration in two ways. We speak of a school system as being under direction of the superintendent, having reference to all the complicated activities of that office and especially to the power of that office to guide and control the system. More recently, students of the science of management have come to use the term in a restricted sense, to refer to but one of the special types of activity essential in administration and carefully to exclude other types. Thus, direction is distinguished from such other activities as planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling, all of which are involved in the total process of administration.

The title director of athletics or of music illustrates the use of the term in its broader and more general meaning. To be director in charge of a total project, such as music instruction, means to be responsible for seeing it through

[1] For a helpful analysis of the problems of this chapter, but developed in terms of political applications, see Henri Fayol, "The Administrative Theory in the State." Chap. IV in *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. Some of the other papers in this volume will be worth reading in this connection.

as a whole, regardless of the number or kinds of activities required to do the work. The one in charge of a unit of service in this broader sense is often referred to as director, even though his title may be principal or superintendent or business manager or even coordinator. The reason for this usage is found, very likely, in the fact that authority lies with this officer and that when he decides or gives orders action almost certainly ensues. By the exercise of his authority goals are determined, action is initiated, procedures are controlled, and movements are oriented—things move by his will, under his direction; hence, we think of the administrator as director.

Technical use of term. According to its technical use, direction is but a small part of this total activity. It is the part that effects the decision, gives the signals to act, orders or empowers others to act, indicates what the action is to be and when it is to start and stop. In its essence, direction is authority on the move, guided and controlled by the will of the officer. Direction is clearly the most conspicuous activity used in administration, the one characteristic that an onlooker sees as he views an enterprise in operation. Also, the proneness of man to want to use authority and to be known as possessing authority, and the thrill that one feels as he uses it, all are combined to make directing the most attractive of all the activities. Plans, organizations, and mechanisms of control and coordination are equally essential, each for its special part; but until direction begins, nothing happens. Even though the reverse is true—that there could be no direction without plans, organization, coordination, and control—yet, these are but forces potential until direction sets them into action, and it is action that most quickly catches our attention and interest.

Authority is equally essential in direction, whether we use the term in its technical or in its general sense; and as a part or as a characteristic feature, it is equally conspicuous in the two. In the former, however, its use is confined to the task of setting things in motion and to steering them. In

the latter, it is applied to the tasks of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling, as well as to directing. As has been already explained, the administrative process is complex in the sense that in it several separate processes are clearly distinguishable.[2] Our study here proposes to examine direction as one of these contributing processes and to ascertain, if possible, whether it, too, is made up of other still lesser processes or is a single element, incapable of further breakdown, and if the latter, what are its characteristics and its possibilities for service?

2. *Functional Analysis Not the Sole Basis for Job Assignment*

Most jobs wider than one function. If one examines the organization of a school system, it will be apparent that job assignments have been made with some regard for the type of activity required, but somewhat more with regard for what one might call total units of service. A teacher's main duty is to instruct; but incident to this, there is organization of pupils and materials, direction and control of activities, and assisting in the general processes of administration. A school principal administers; but he has also to supervise, to coordinate instruction, and often may teach, as well. Thus, job assignments are usually broader than single types of activities, even though we might cite such partial exceptions as an assignment to do research or to supervise. It is important here to note that "type of activity" is *one* of the bases with reference to which the principle of the division of labor is applied in school organization. Like the strands in a rope, however, most job assignments are made up of several separate elements or activities, and even though the intertwining of the rope's strands is not quite parallel to the more intricate and less regular interlocking of the separate processes of a job, yet, separate strands do not make a rope and separate processes or types of activity do not make up a

[2] See Marshall E. Dimock, *The Executive in Action.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945. Also Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. Pp. 1–11.

job assignment. In both, there is something important about the way the separate parts are arranged to operate together.

Scientific study would not get far if it were to assume that the nature of the administrative process is determined and clearly evidenced for each one of its elements by the place that element now holds as we find it functioning in job assignments. The approach of science would be to try, first, to find the nature of any process it wishes to study, and then to consider whether, in assignments, it is being used in accordance with its nature.[3] Science need not assume that jobs are defined either rightly or wrongly, as now assigned; yet, science would not ignore the fact that people have capacity for performing more than one specialized form of activity, or that few people are content with a highly specialized job requiring continuous repetition of one activity, or that most of the separate activities of school management are so interlocked with other activities that to separate them in assignments would be like asking a group of artists to join in a division of labor in the final work of painting a portrait. The nature of a process, like the nature of the elements of an artist's paint, must dictate the use we make of them. We study the nature of a process in order that we may make the best possible use of it.

Function and job grew up together. We need not try to determine here which should come first, the job or the processes for performing it. It seems likely that they originated together and that each must have been influential in determining the nature of the other.[4] But it is not quite this simple, either; for man has limitations, determined in part by his physical make-up and in part by his mental and emo-

[3] See Principal Grant Robertson, "The Future of Administrative Science." *Public Administration,* 4:8–11, 1926.

[4] C. Bertrand Thompson, *Scientific Management*—A collection of the more significant articles describing the Taylor System of management. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914. This provides reference to the best of the early literature in this field.

tional capacities. All these—process, job, and man—no doubt, must be involved in shaping both process and job in any given case. By his ingenuity and skill, a good administrator often can use one type of process in a manner to produce results commonly produced by some different process. *Controls* can be set up so as to provoke action that otherwise would have to be effected by *direction*. This type of thing is done with specially useful effect when face saving is involved. Such versatility of use, wherein a highly specialized process is applied in the performance of jobs for which the process was not originally developed, allows us to think of these separate processes as devices or as technical tools, specialized, but capable of various uses; or, to the same end, to think of management jobs as being at least somewhat pliable as to the processes required for their performance.

The powers, limitations, and purposes of men shape both process and job. By present job assignments we can say that to some extent they recognize process or type of activity, but that there is a limit beyond which specialization on the basis of the type of activity does not go, the result being that most jobs are complex as to types of processes required in their performance. As to the influence of process upon job assignment and vice versa, it seems clear that there is give-and-take but, finally, that both have to yield, also, to the purposes, powers, and limitations of man as a manager. Man has devised numerous processes to fit a variety of needs, but he can use a specialized process for the performance of only a limited number of different tasks.[5] Similarly, specialized parts of job assignments can be performed by no more than a very few of the available specialized processes, a particular one of which usually is greatly superior for the task. Good administration brings right process to right task, making its choice by studying the need of job and

[5] In management, each little operation taken separately may be seen as a special function. But groups of these lesser functions may be so combined as to form a larger function. As process, one of these may be as truly unified, as clearly a separate function, as the other, when it is thought of as a feature of the total enterprise.

of process alike, having in mind man's purpose, the nature of the enterprise as a whole, and his ability to fit each to the other.

3. *Activities Involved in Direction*[6]

Bases for defining the nature of the process called direction. To get at the nature of the activity or process that we call direction, it is necessary to have in mind its several constituent elements. The thing that counts, however, is not alone a question of what these elements are, but also, of how they behave when at work in direction and how people react to them. In any government, what counts is not merely the machine that we set up or the power that we apply or the results that we aim to achieve or the smoothness of the process of governing; finally, it is a question of output, of the work that is accomplished. Furthermore, accomplishment is not to be measured solely by the decisions made and the actions taken, but also by the way everyone feels about both the processes and the outcomes.

Direction as a part of the administrative process is not direction until there is action or, at least, a release of energy in a form calculated to start or to control or to guide action. When an executive faces a problem, he studies it, searching for and reviewing possible ways of meeting it, and finally, making up his mind what he will do. Strictly speaking, this activity is planning. Once he announces his decision, he thereby authorizes action or provides instructions that imply orders for action. This activity is direction. The problem in question may have had to do with policy, personnel, program, intruction or anything else, so long as it called for decision and action.

[6] In any analysis of any of the processes of government, one does well to have in mind such basic principles of government as the separation of powers. See Marshall E. Dimock, "Some Aspects of American Administrative Law." *Public Administration,* 9:417–422, October, 1931. Also Thomas Reed Powell, "Separation of Powers." *Political Science Quarterly,* 27:215–238, June, 1912; and 28:34–48, March, 1913.

Breakdown of the process. If one examines this total situation, he finds these five phases: (1) a question is raised by a problem or by work to be done; (2) thinking out and announcing a decision or giving an order; (3) action of others, in terms of the order; (4) change takes place, *i.e.*, work is accomplished; (5) inspection or checkup follows. Thus, direction originates in or is preceded by planning, and it issues in activities of the recipients of the directions and, finally, in inspection of results. Planning could be quite insignificant—what to do being obvious—or it might be a long and formal process requiring some organization and direction to accomplish. Little study of these five forms of activity in actual practice is required to convince one that these are, in fact, but separate phases of a continuous process, which in administration must be regarded as a unitary feature. If the five steps are not well harmonized, it cannot be efficient administration. Without our pausing here to define it, efficiency must be our goal in management.[7]

To proceed a step further with our analysis, we must note what things or persons, as well as what processes, are present in direction. There was need for direction, *i.e.*, work to be done, which impelled the administration to move. How direction would move in a given case might be dictated, in part, by the nature of the work; in part, by the law; in part, by surrounding circumstances (plant, staff, equipment, public opinion, tradition, finances, or the weather); in part, by the will of the administrator—governed in each case by knowledge, skill, prejudices, and tastes. Here, also, we find considerable complexity.[8] It is difficult to see how the administrator will decide when, by his intelligence, he finds the

[7] For a discussion of efficiency in this connection, see Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. Chap. IX.

[8] Norman M. Pearson, "Fayolism as the Necessary Complement to Taylorism." *The American Political Science Review*, 39:68–80, February, 1945. Fayol and Taylor approached the study of management from opposite directions—Taylor, by study of doing the work; Fayol, by study of uses of authority by officers.

work demanding one thing, his staff not well trained to do what is needed, and public opinion demanding something still different. It appears that directing is, by its nature, a hazardous business—hazardous in the sense that it may or may not be able to compound these elements rationally. Tradition, prejudice, or wrong sense of values may lead or compel one to ignore the claims of one or more of the proper determiners.

Scientific study is concerned only with finding the right way to direct, however; it need not wait for practice to accept and apply its findings. Nothing could show more clearly than such analyses as the above why administration is so often poor. The process is complicated and difficult. The factors involved, either for a part or the whole of the process, are numerous and the kinds of activities required are varied; whether knowledge or some other factors will guide the administrator is bound to be uncertain. A closer scrutiny of these several elements and of these several phases of the process may throw some light upon how each element plays its part and, so, upon the nature of direction as a separate activity and still as a part of the administrative process as a whole.

4. Direction and Other Processes Closely Interrelated

Direction and authority. As a process, direction is often viewed as some superauthority or superpower that enters from the outside to determine what shall and what shall not happen in the enterprise in question. There is a philosophy with which this view is consistent,[9] but it is not the philosophy of democracy, upon which we in America base all that we do in public education. For a democracy, the forming of the rule and of the school alike rests with the people. In ruling one's own affairs, consideration is sure to be given to one's own purposes and to the affairs themselves. It is more accurate with us, therefore, to assume that the power to direct is first evolved from a study of our purposes and of

[9] See Sec. 3 of Chap. 3, above.

our schools' needs, and that we have expressed our purpose in the form of a plan or a set of specifications. This authority is not, therefore, super to the schools themselves, but is actually of them.

This is an important characteristic of direction, for its being derived from the facts and circumstances and purposes of the very thing it directs, makes it subservient to that thing. It is thus that our school law is built up; our school-board rules are formulated; and the organization, routines, and working procedures of the schools are constructed. True, the laws, rules, and routines are made effective by persons (officers). Because of this, they may be capable of abuse, but that does not change the fact that it is the nature of direction to be derived from the schools before it is applied to them. This is our theory, whether our practice makes the most of it or not. It is to be remembered that the people hold the power to remove those who defy this principle too much.

Direction and planning. Because of the proneness of officials to abuse their authority, the question of how to extract (plan for) direction is important. It is obvious that an administrator could give an order that would be entirely sound except for the fact that those who receive and carry it out feel no partnership in it. One does better those things he believes in and desires to have done. It is in this sense that the relationship of direction to planning becomes a factor in the directing. Planning is, in a sense, but the early stage of direction. In it thought has to be given to the question of directing execution, so the planner's thoughts flit from plan to execution and back many times.

Direction and the nature of the work directed. At the other end of direction there is a corresponding connection with the work being done. Direction may end in a purpose formulated, a plan drawn, a control set up, or the coordination of activities. Direction, as administration, as an order, empowers, compels, or guides the recipient of the order. At

its start, direction is the primary force in evidence. As the recipient takes up the order, he moves at first largely in terms of this outside power of command; but as he gets the work under way, he becomes more and more a partner in the plan and, so, becomes self directed, in the sense that the order is taken over as his own purpose and responsibility, his own order to himself. As administrative direction senses this change, it becomes less active and gradually withdraws, whereupon command becomes self-command, administrative direction retaining only an indirect hold through inspection, which is what we call control. Thus, direction becomes so shaded into control or, it might be, into organization or co-ordination or planning, that neither director nor directed would be conscious of when or precisely how the change in process had been brought about. It is in these transitions that we are best able to see administration as an art.

To get at the nature of direction, then, it is apparent that a cross section must be taken at its point of origin, another when it is fully effective, and a third as it is subsiding. At its point of origin, it is scarcely separable from planning and, at its conclusion, it gives place to one or more of the other administrative activities. In many cases, the moments during which administrative direction operates alone may be few. It arises in the midst of and withdraws in favor of its companion processes.

This interlocking is a characteristic of direction when viewed as a democratic process. Only in autocracy is it wholly separate and distinct, from its origin to its culmination and conclusion. Certainly no profound knowledge of psychology is required to see that to separate it from its natural relationships to these other processes is to impose violent change upon its nature.

5. *Authority as an Element in Direction*

Authority has to be limited. It is the nature of direction not only to point the way, but also to compel action. There

must be authority in an order, otherwise it is only a request and not direction in an administrative sense.[10] To compel is impossible without power to penalize or, at least, to stop nonconformance, but to penalize nonconformance that is due to poor direction could be unjust; therefore, power to penalize must be so circumscribed that it may become effective only when attached to blame. Thus, power to compel must be accompanied by responsibility for clear and reasonable direction—for use, not abuse, of the power.[11]

Authority is created by law, and laws are made for purposes. Some laws command or authorize action, while others prevent action. The authority of school law is specific, in the sense that it has a defined purpose in it and is not granted for use otherwise. Whoever has the authority of school law has limited authority, or authority attached to a stated purpose. Possession of such authority implies responsibility to use it for its proper ends and none other. Laws can be somewhat general, or they may be very specific. In school work, boards of education often enact rules to make the laws more specific, one object being to choose what application of the law is desired; another object may be to make those in authority more definitely responsible to the board.

The authority to direct is restricted, also, in the sense that it is granted to officers and employees, not to persons. An office or an assignment is a limited set of responsibilities, with power to perform those responsibilities only. When the job to be done cannot be strictly defined in advance of its doing, the authority must be general and comprehensive

[10] An order may take the form of a request or a suggestion; but without authority behind it, it might or might not accomplish the work of directing, depending upon the will of the one who receives it. One who acts at his own will is not acting under the direction of another, even though the two wills may coincide.

[11] James Mill says in his essay, "*Government*," "All the difficult questions of government relate to the means of restraining those in whose hands are lodged the powers necessary for the protection of all, from making bad use of it."

for a broad purpose. The purpose or prescription of the law and the prescription of the job are what define the responsibility of the one who directs execution.

The point of interest here is that authority, as an element in direction, is not a detached power, not truly independent of the work it guides. First, it is attached to a purpose and thereby limited. Second, it is granted to officers, not to persons, and so is available only to such officers as have it and only for the purposes it embodies and within the limits of the officer's job. In other words, power and responsibility are joined. This most striking of direction's characteristics is thus so interlocked with the element of control, so inseparable from it, that we must think of one if we think of the other.

How authority may be abused in direction. Lest this may seem an over-statement of fact, let us note that this is the generally accepted theory of how authority is to operate as an element in direction. Since an officer is a person, it is possible for him to break away from responsibility—to ignore and defy the purpose of the law or of the assignment of his job. One could be given a job to do, but inadequate authority for doing it. One could *assume* authority or *dodge* responsibility. An officer could *sublet* authority to, or suddenly *withdraw* authority from, another. Organization lines are often loosely made. Indeed, it is a trick of bad administration to push these lines back and forth in order to gain opportunity or to avoid responsibility. But these are not sound direction; they are only abuses or neglect of it. Knowledge of theory, although it cannot guarantee sound practice, makes available a good foundation for it.

6. *Knowledge as an Element in Direction*

To function, authority and responsibility must use knowledge. The administrator is given an assignment of work to do and the law provides him with authority to do it. Neither the assignment nor the law tells him in any detail how to proceed. Often they tell him only in general terms

what the work includes or what ends it seeks to attain. The law and the authorities that make the assignment rely upon the officer to decide these details. Thus, the administrator decides the details of his own power and his own responsibilities. He is both authority and control. The reason why such a job exists lies in the fact that the details of the work cannot be known and, so, cannot be specified in advance. These details have to be worked out, and can be, only after all the factors to be dealt with have come together.

From this it is clear that authority and job assignment are incomplete without the officer who comes in to lay out the work and to give the orders for doing it. The people have made the law on the assumption that someone can be found who will be able to give the law effective expression in an institution for achieving their general purposes. The people make no pretense of knowing how to run a school system, so they enact a law that empowers some wiser person to run it for them. Thus, administration is authority, it is responsibility; but it is both of these for doing a job that requires knowledge and skill to accomplish it. These latter elements —call them knowledge, for short—complete the triumvirate of forces—authority, responsibility, knowledge—which, when properly combined and set going, form the essence of direction and, indeed, of administration in all its phases.

Knowledge is the cutting edge of authority. How, then, does knowledge join hands with authority and responsibility in the particular process we call direction?[12] Direction is focused upon work which it is to accomplish through others. Its function is to set workers to specific parts in the work and to keep their energies so adjusted to the task that they will harmonize and, together, achieve. Knowing has reference, not only to the general purposes, but to the specific and concrete ends sought step by step through the task: knowing

[12] The wide development of research bureaus and divisions and of planning departments, in government, in industry, and in education, are formal recognition of the importance of knowledge in management.

how to get others to apply themselves to the tasks of doing; knowing what is well done from what is badly done; knowing how to perform and, at the end, how to conclude the work, so that those engaged will feel pride in it and be ready for new assignments. These are aspects of the directing process which are quite as essential as authority and responsibility. These are not mechanical steps; they are acts of the mind at work, seeing ahead where and how to apply energy and judging what may be the outcome of each step taken. It is intelligence interpreting responsibility as it sorts out facts, conceives what action is needed, and judges possibilities of outcomes. It is intelligence finding a path and forming a channel for the flow of authority through the maze of the work. In a sense, knowledge is the cutting edge of authority, moving through its tasks and being drawn true to its course by responsibility.[13]

In our theory of direction, one cannot think of these elements as being separate and independent; one cannot think of them as competing for place. It takes the three in active harmony to make direction a job worthy of an intelligent person's effort or of the people's trust and confidence. Authority uncontrolled by responsibility and unguided by knowledge is not a safe power to put into any man's hands.

7. *The Nature of Direction as Reflected in Its Behavior*

Laws or plans as potential direction. As has been already noted, direction can exist only if there are purpose to attain, work to be done, and people to do it. Direction is effective when it gets the work done with the least expenditure of time, energy, and material commensurate with the quality of work desired, and if it is done to the full satisfaction of the workers. The moment direction begins to operate, it affects someone, because, to be given, direction must also be

[13] See Herman Finer, "Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government." *Public Administration Review,* 1:335–350, Summer, 1941.

received. Direction could exist potentially in a law not often used but also not possible to disregard. As such, it would be a plan for direction. One effect of such a plan would be to establish a control, but the power of command in it would be potential direction only until something set it going as an order. In such a case, direction could be touched off by the appearance of a task that fitted it. Thus, direction can anticipate work in the sense that a plan or a control (existing in the form of a law or a rule) may suddenly become effective as direction.

Direction may be in specific or general terms. Direction can be applied to small or large tasks. To an office boy one says, "Do this," or "Do that"—each a minute task. To a principal of a school one hands a copy of the school law, a book of school regulations, possibly a school budget, and the curriculum that has been in use, introducing him to his staff and to the plant and the office and record systems in use and saying, "This is your school and your part of our school system, and these are the directions and materials for running it. In what I hand you there is authority and there are some commands; also, there are many explanations and instructions and much general information." In one of these cases, direction is very narrow and specific; in the other, it is broad and general. The office boy is told his duty, the principal is left to find and define his duty for himself. In the one case, direction covers a brief moment of time; in the other, it is prolonged, even continuous, forever reaching ahead, and ever reshaping itself to fit the changing situation.[14]

Direction takes its cue from the nature of the task. Direc-

[14] For the corresponding effect of social change upon law, read Roscoe Pound, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922; or Benjamin Cardozo, *The Growth of the Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924; or C. G. Haines, "Effects of the Growth of Administrative Law upon Traditional Anglo-American Legal Theories and Practices." *The American Political Science Review,* 26:875–894, October, 1932.

tion may be effected in many ways. A signal or a spoken command or decision that is effective as an order may be brief and simple or require extended explanation to complete. It may call for execution in the present or at a future time. It may involve response by one or by many. As the complexity of the order increases, care in giving it must increase if it is to be understood, for when it reaches a point where the order is not clearly understood or is not remembered by those who receive it, it ceases to be direction. Whether at this point blame lies with the one directing or with the one receiving need not detain us here; the point is that direction has failed to direct. For a solution one may repeat the order and add explanations or, better still, may put the order in writing, so it may be read over and over.

Oral direction. Each of these two ways of directing is capable of wide use or of use in a wide variety of cases. Direction by oral command may be given to one person or to as many as can be assembled to hear the order. It can be used for simple orders only, however, but by repeating and with use of explanations, it can have quite a range. It can be effective for present application, but only for a limited future application, since nonuse would soon reach a point where forgetting would enter, to stop it. Spoken directions can be vivid and forceful and personal, and thereby may convey something of the director's feelings that makes the order more meaningful. The speaker's enthusiasms may thus be carried over to the listeners, along with the order. However, the reverse of this is equally true—the manner of speaking a command may stimulate antagonisms and, so, detract by virtue of impressions made by a poor or disagreeable voice or personality.

Written or printed directions. Direction by writing can provide against forgetting and can go far toward overcoming complexities; though it may not convey enthusiasms so well, it may leave recipients with a sense of security by virtue of the certainty that the order will not be changed when they

hear it again. Direction through the written word may range from the mandate of a constitution or a statute—orders of great continuity and permanence—to an informal note or memorandum calling a committee together.[15]

Direction often a by-product of other administrative functions. Direction is often made effective indirectly through written words or documents designed primarily to serve as controls or to set forth plans or to establish coordinations or to create organization. Laws, rules, record and report forms, organization charts, designed for these other purposes, not only establish the school system as to form; but, along with and by the nature of its form, these documents provide for a manner of operation. By accepting a principalship one accepts powers and duties. The position is itself an order the moment it is assigned, and the rules defining it stand as a continuous command to execute, even though they may be descriptive and explanatory only and not at all in the form of a command.

Orders by word of mouth are easily changeable or recallable; those in writing are more difficult to change or withdraw. Direction has use for both, since it must deal with swiftly changing aims, materials, circumstances, and forces, as well as with those that are static, slow-changing, or long-enduring. An order that is too permanent in form may stand in the way of progress; but one that is too temporary may endanger stability. Of the need, in any case, direction itself must judge. Thus, direction is unavoidably responsible for using discrimination in its choice of ways to command. The nature of this responsibility is not to be found by a study of the possible forms of direction alone or

[15] Legislative direction takes the form of law; administrative direction takes the form of action. Board rules, called sublegislation, are more specific than statutes, but they are administrative direction only when they go into action. See James Hart, "Some Aspects of Delegated Rule Making." *Virginia Law Review*, 25:810–823, May, 1939. Also John A. McIntire, "Government Corporations as Administrative Agencies: An Approach." *The George Washington Law Review*, 4:161–210, January, 1936.

by a study of the work alone or the possible value of the work to the people concerned, but also by a study of its effects upon those who execute the order.

Direction a vital concern of those who execute its orders. The question of the extent to which direction should be shaped in terms of the wishes of those directed is both important and difficult.[16] A satisfied, self-respecting, and independent personnel is the best expression of democracy in government only if that personnel is doing its work with high purpose, efficiency, and pride of achievement. Of all our units of government, the school should be our best expression of democracy, since it is training the youth, among other things, for self-government. Direction can contribute to the development of these attitudes and feelings in a staff or it can do much to destroy them, by the manner of its command. In a school system, these characteristics are, indeed, an end; but in the management of the system, they are also a means to efficient execution of direction. If direction forgets that they are a means to good school work and, instead, treats them as a means of gaining popularity or stronger control for the director, he will soon become either a tyrant or an appeaser, for such inclinations grow by exercise.

Direction must adapt itself to circumstances in still another way, which calls for great power of discrimination and, perhaps, also, for artistry in performance. If one is directed to do work in which he is deeply interested and in which he has a real stake, he may be regarded as in a state of readiness to act when direction is given. If, on the other hand, direction brings work that is repugnant, that he does

[16] There are occasions when direction must deal with the public. Through the district meeting, the people may legislate for the schools; at times, individuals or groups may desire to present questions to the board at a hearing. In such matters direction is likely to be involved. See the author's "The District Meeting in School Government." *The American School Board Journal,* 111:19–21, July; 27, 28, September, 1945. Also Elden S. Magaw, "Legal Aspects of Administrative Hearings and Findings." *Mississippi Law Journal,* 12:295, March, 1940.

not understand, that may be less than complimentary to his social or professional status, or that may otherwise tend to thwart his ambitions, he may be regarded as in a state of opposition to it.

Nature of the relationship between one who gives and one who executes orders. A director has authority, knowledge, and his own leadership and personality to apply as means of making direction effective. Of how best to apply these he must be the judge. By the character and tone of his order he can apply each of these factors in many separate ways and may combine them with great variety of emphasis upon one or another of the ways. One can make authority stand out in an order in such a manner as to dare the recipient to resist it by so much as a moment's hesitancy. Yet, at the opposite extreme, it can be so used as to lend dignity to the order and honor to the one who is chosen to execute it. By one, the director seems to challenge with a sneer and to hint that he can and may use his personal powers to compel action. By the other, he speaks as one who feels the responsibility and the dignity of an office and assumes a corresponding attitude on the part of his subordinate—as if it were the full intention and desire of director and recipient alike to work together as partners at a task. The possible variations or combinations of authority, knowledge, and personal attitude, from one of these extremes to the other is great enough to meet any kind of case if one can but know and choose the right one.

If a school system is well organized, then each position in it is defined and whoever accepts a position can be assumed to be willing and ready to meet its responsibilities. For a superior to give an order to a subordinate on any other assumption is to belittle his own office and almost certainly to offend his subordinate. If this element of authority is not needed as a sort of warning challenge to compel, is it needed at all? The answer is Yes. It is this element of authority that establishes the authenticity of an order. Certain powers of direction lie with the superintendent. It is the

business of any subordinate who is to execute such orders to make sure that the order comes from the superintendent, for only then is it authoritative. Authority resides in title to office and is not increased by shouting or snarling or violent speech or bold and domineering manners. Direction is effected by officers, not persons, and by the explaining of what is to be done and seeing that the explanations are understood. Intimidation of the subordinate may provoke submission to, but not the understanding of, an order —much less, the will to execute it. An order given with dignity and clarity and with respect for the recipient stimulates desire to prompt and effective execution. In practice, direction is effected more often through the language of instruction than of command, authority of the official signature having identical effect to empower or compel in the two alike.

It is true that in the staff of a large school system one may expect to find a wide range of readiness to cooperate and that, among executives and subordinates alike, the theoretical possibilities of direction just sketched would not always be realized. But sound direction is just and firm, as well as rational, polite, and cooperative. And although sound execution of orders is cooperative and responsible, it requires no groveling or humiliating acquiescence and should resent and defy such an element or quality wherever it appears in any order. If authority has to be used to get cooperative response to direction, it should be applied with the quiet, firm, and impersonal dignity of the office it represents and with no display of personal power or animosity. Administration that operates on a lower plane than this in a school system is unsound, however effective it may be in a lumber camp or in the army. The nature of school service establishes this as a principle.

Basis for evaluating direction. By this view of direction at work, direction does not appear as something superior and independent, but rather, as a cooperating partner in an enterprise. It has power and can initiate and decide mat-

ters; but when closely examined for the nature of its responsibility, it is found to be held to account both for what it does and for how it does it. The measure of its success is seen not merely in the order given and in the manner of giving those orders but, finally, in its outcomes and in the attitudes of those who respond to the orders. Content and manner of ordering are subject to self-control; but the reactions of subordinates are control from the outside, and these reactions may reward or penalize a director.

It is apparent, also, that direction does not depend upon authority alone but upon knowledge and upon judgment and skill in using both knowledge and authority and upon the quality of the director's personality. Authority cannot guide action when knowledge of what or how to do the work is lacking. Leadership is as indispensable as authority; but without knowledge and skill, neither can produce effective direction. It is apparent, too, that direction often tries to use authority when it should be using knowledge and skill in social and professional relationships. Thus, added up, direction is a difficult, a complex, and a highly responsible type of administrative activity.

8. *Direction through a Hierarchy*

Ways and means for direction have to be provided. In the setting up of an organization, the main object is to get a division of labor that will produce good results and that can function with economy. As has already been noted, good results must mean more than a good end product. In school work, the machinery should be as nearly self-propelled as possible, for self-imposed tasks are usually the best performed. Authority must be present, but its main object is to give official status to decisions, authorizations, and orders—not to drive people to their tasks. Teachers need no one to drive them; they merely await notice of what the task is and, with that information, they move to action by their own purpose and intelligence and sense of responsibility. Direction must have power to compel, but such power

should be used little in school work, except to meet urgent needs, and then only for as long as it takes to dismiss those to whom it has to be applied.

Direction is a key function in a school system, because it alone can set the school machinery in motion or stop it. The question here is, How shall we apply direction? Shall we have it all in one place or scattered throughout the system? If direction is to be effective, it must get to its work quickly and with precision. Delay between order and execution affords chance for error by forgetting or misunderstanding. Delay can hardly be avoided in a large enterprise if the system of communication is not designed for prompt, speedy, and accurate transmission of orders and instructions. The postal system, telephone, and radio, have done much to solve the problem of communication so that the spoken word can go from central office directly and immediately to the farthest school; the written word, in a relatively short time.[17]

Machinery to facilitate formulation as well as the giving of direction. It is the function of direction to formulate, as well as promulgate, orders. To formulate an order, one must have information and, usually, must arrange facts and reason some about them. For the central office of a school system this will often require an extensive program of assembling facts throughout the system and of transmitting them to the central office for study. Those who supply these facts are thus contributing to the development of direction, much as they do later when they receive the order and interpret it for use in their work. The more vital these two contacts are between direction at one end and execution at the other, the more harmonious and the more dependable they become as features of the management system.

Centralized vs. distributed authority and responsibility in

[17] See John J. Carson, "The Role of Communication in the Process of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 4:7–15, Winter, 1944.

direction. The distance between the superintendent's office and the farthest classroom in a large city system is great. As the number of employees in a system increases, the possibility of their receiving full direction from a single central office decreases. Also, as the district grows in size from a single, one-room school to some hundreds of large schools, including schools of widely different types, the possibility of one person's being able to direct all activities declines. To get direction to all the points where it is needed, one of two things has to be done: either large districts must be broken up into small ones or a plan must be devised for distributing part of the authority so that it can be brought to its tasks promptly, however distant they may be.

In a large city school district, there will be questions that are of general concern to all the schools alike and others that are of concern in no more than one school or classroom. Health education is partly a question of general policy and of budget, but in each school it is a very special problem. Of citizenship education, of safety education, of school-community relationships, and hundreds of other matters, the same is true. Obviously, the general policies of the district as a whole must be separately interpreted to fit these separate school needs. This is a wide realm, requiring intimate, rather than general, direction. In order that proper direction may be provided, study must be made separately of these lesser areas, and speed of decision is often of the highest importance.

Experience has shown that it is better to bring direction out to these separate tasks than to try to take all such minor problems to the central office for decision. In a very large school, a still further subdivision of the task of direction is equally necessary, for the same reason. Thus, a hierarchy of direction has evolved. To extend his own powers, the superintendent has added assistant superintendents and directors; to extend their reaches, he has added school principals; to extend the powers of principals, he has added vice-principals, department heads, or chairmen; and even

with all this provision, the teacher still has to do a great amount of self-directing.

Machinery of direction not separate from that of administration as a whole. This hierarchy of officers and of authority is not a hierarchy of direction alone. It also plans, coordinates, organizes, and controls. Its function is the whole realm of administration. Because direction is so interlocked with the other administrative processes and so related to other than administrative functions, even this wide distribution of the power of direction through a hierarchy would be inadequate without the support from other functionaries. The function of research is as important for helping with planning and, so, with the shaping of orders and decisions, as it is as a support for teaching or personnel work or supervision or curriculum making or health work. Librarians, doctors, nurses, coordinators, personnel workers, supervisors, all contribute to the function of direction. Thus, we not only have scattered direction throughout the field, bringing it close to its smaller, as well as to its larger, tasks; but we have made great point of bringing it into close unity and cooperation with other functions. This is because of our theory that direction must grow out of the nature of the problems that make up the work that has to be directed.

The hierarchic concept useful. The word hierarchy, which has been in bad repute in government, tends to annoy some people who, not knowing this theory, think of a hierarchy as the machinery of autocracy.[18] Although in school administration this plan can, no doubt, be abused, in its true nature, the school hierarchy is the authority and mechanism by which direction is so designed and so located

[18] The hierarchic concept has been carefully examined in connection with a study of bureaucracy as it was conducted in the Swiss civil service. The author concluded "that bureaucracy and democracy are not antithetical but that they belong to each other as structural aspects of a fully organized community." Carl Joachim Friedrich and Taylor Cole, *Responsible Bureaucracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. P. 88.

that it can find its proper purposes, select its appropriate form and procedures, and set the talents of officers and employees to their proper tasks when and where their efforts are needed. It is by such means that we have been able, not only to bring direction into close contact with execution, but also, so to specialize within the realm of direction itself that great refinement of the process has been effected.

The functional and geographic bases of organization. This wide distribution of direction raises the question of how or by what principle a division of labor can be made in this function. This is, of course, a question of organization; but since in this case it is direction that is being organized, the matter is a concern of this chapter.

Things that affect direction are distance, time, the problem of getting a proper fact basis for direction (planning for direction), the problem of making orders understood (communication), and the problem of following up on orders or on requests for information (control). If physical distance becomes too great, direction will necessarily be broken up on geographical lines, subdirectors being assigned to areas of a size possible to cover. The question of which matters to direct from a central office and which from a single school is not quite so simple. General over-all matters would go to the central office, but what these are is a question so special that, in part, it must be dealt with in a manner peculiar to the particular circumstances and locality.

One cannot distribute the authority to direct without considering the nature of the work to which the authority is to be applied. Lines cannot be drawn arbitrarily through management problems as one draws lines on a district map. Such problems overlap and interlock in endless ways. One cannot say offhand for what matters a great city district can have general policies and central control. Nor can one decide how general a policy should be in order to produce a useful amount of common action and, at the same time, leave room for appropriate freedom to meet the special needs of school *X* or classroom 24 of school *Y*.

Direction has to deal with questions of finance, plant, instruction, health, safety, sanitation, research, personnel, libraries, public relations, discipline, attendance, in endless variety. How to separate local from central direction in each of these and endless other matters is the question for the authority and mechanism of the hierarchy, as they attach to this tangle of work. Money has to be spent at all schools for salaries and wages, for supplies and equipment, for operating and upkeep of plant, for furnishing and decorating; and each school has its special needs. If salary and wage scales differed from school to school, there would be trouble. Clearly, this is a problem for central management. On the other hand, not all schools want the same kinds or amounts of supplies of paper, paste, and ink. This is a matter for local decision. Thus, by long experience in financing schools, we have learned to separate what is primarily a local from what is primarily a central office functicn. A proper distribution of direction to many of the other functions is much less obvious, but the principle is the same.

By long experience in many forms of government work two bases or principles for dividing up the directing service have been developed: (1) division that is necessitated by the extent of the territory involved; and (2) division that is necessitated by the type and the extent of the service required. The one, which we may call geographical, is known by many as departmental; the other we call functional (see Chap. 3). In practice, we have applied both concepts, and usually they are applied together with good effect if each is properly applicable separately. It goes without saying that there will be difference of opinion as to when and where and how to apply these concepts, either separately or in combination. An assistant superintendent covering every form of instruction, from nursery school through junior college, must of necessity be less a specialist in instruction than one who is in charge of but one of the instructional units. If the complexity of the work pushes its director back too far from instruction (he cannot know

all fields), he is likely to lack a proper understanding of the services he is directing, so, he may become interested in directing as an end.

On the other hand, a separation by functions may end in destroying the necessary coordination of separate units (kindergarten, primary, secondary) and so may seriously disrupt the instructional programs of the children.

Such arguments are healthy and afford assurance that adherents to each of the concepts will know its own weaknesses and guard well against them. The object of organization is not primarily to make direction simple and foolproof, but to produce good instructional service. There is clearly no offhand or mechanical solution of functional organization problem. Function involves learner, teacher, and manager, to say nothing of a wide variety of materials and attending circumstances. To get direction close enough to the service it directs in a large district, so that it can act promptly and with full understanding, means that it has to be divided and subdivided. The choice first is between small and large districts. With the latter, we must have hierarchic distribution of direction if we want unity of control. The advantages of large size are bound to disappear, however, if the unity of direction is broken and the continuity of control between central office and the most distant classroom gives way to too complete independence for each tiny unit. On the other hand, that advantage also vanishes if the local independence is too closely circumscribed by a distant central power.

9. *Unified vs. Divided Direction*

Strength and weakness of hierarchies. Direction by a hierarchy is divided direction in only a very limited sense, since by that system final control lies, still, with one officer. Powers that are delegated also can be withdrawn. Every member of a hierarchy understands this and knows that it is his business to serve, not merely as an independent unit in the system, but primarily as an extension of the powers and

personality of his superior. The strength of the system lies in its unity and in the speed and consistency with which it operates.[19]

The hierarchy also has some weaknesses, not because of the theory upon which it operates, but because of the weaknesses of human nature. It is by no means easy to serve as an extension of another's personality if, at the same time, one must meet the problems of directing a unit of service. With an ignorant, a jealous, or an arbitrary superior, one is put to it to avoid the Scylla of being too independent, while trying to steer clear of the Charybdis of failing to produce results in his work. Too close scrutiny of details by a superior or failure to delegate the power necessary may put a subordinate in a position in which he can hardly avoid offense.

In a hierarchy, the principle of one-man control applies at its best only when the whole administrative mechanism is itself under the control of a force outside the hierarchy. A board of education representing the law and responsible to the people, is supposed to serve this purpose. This is, indeed, a dependable final control; but since throughout a school system a great deal of discretionary power is necessary, this external control cannot be sharp, quick, and detailed, or easy to apply. Friction has to become serious before a board will initiate action to stop it. Even if a board has formulated its general policies with care, organized the staff and the program in clear-cut terms, and defined major procedures and routines as far as is feasible, there still will be endless chance for misunderstanding and disagreement as to the application of policies and the fit of machinery to concrete situations. Perfect cooperation is seldom fully attainable.

Governing power derives in part from the intelligence of those directed. If a school system employs intelligent

[19] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. In Chap. VII, "The Role of Authority," Simon discusses important aspects of unity in organization.

people, it must expect that they will want to have part in shaping government in so far as the government directly affects their work. Intelligent people, by their proper rights, one might almost say,[20] will insist upon a fair amount of self-direction or of decision as to what the directions shall be. The question is how to provide for a proper use of this and still have large school systems. There must be something better than an endless number of small, independent, one-teacher schools. In other words, direction is affected by the nature of the people involved, as well as by the nature of the work to be directed. The degree of intelligence of those who are to be directed, as well as of those who direct, has to be taken into account. The high intelligence of teachers is as primary a consideration in direction for schools as is the legal authority of executives, even though the law may seem to take little positive account of the teacher's intelligence as such.

How to unite the director's authority with the intelligence of the directed. The question here is how to recognize this power of self-direction. It can be accomplished, in part, by informal and, in part, by formal provisions for its participation in direction. Through board regulations and job assignments, the powers and duties of all employees can be made reasonably clear. Beyond that, common sense, professional ethics, and the trained judgment of educators have to be the guide. Often it is not a question of an employee's legal right to have a say in direction, but rather, of his moral or professional right, under our system of social proprieties, to be treated with proper respect. This may be viewed, also, as a right of the people to expect their executives to use the best talent available where it is needed, regardless of whether it is the talent of an executive or of an instructor.

This seems sound enough as theory, but in practice an

[20] "Rights" meaning, here, the rights based upon the dignity and responsibility of their office. The nature and importance of the work and the character, personality, and training required to do the work are an index of the trust and responsibility borne.

actual division of labor has to be worked out. It was shown above that, as a process, direction includes discovery and definition of its problems, preparing for decisions and orders, formulating them, announcing or giving them, and checking to see with what effect they are carried out; that, at the beginning, this process is planning, in the middle is directing, and at the end is control; but that the three have to be assigned together in order to function as direction. Planning is an intellectual activity. It requires no application of authority and effects no change in practice as long as it does not reach the stage of decision. It seems obvious that in this area there could be no possible reason why others besides executives should not participate, and there are important reasons why they should. Teachers should help plan the courses and curriculums, the care and management of children in the school, the routines of classroom procedure, the records to be kept, and many other matters, for the obvious reason that they are trained especially for such work and that they are the ones who are to execute those plans.

At the next stage—formulating the decisions—the same is true, and for the same reasons. When the third stage—decision—is reached, however, the element of authority enters. All members of a school staff might plan together and together put the plan into shape for adoption. At that point, only those can serve who have authority to apply. A board may give that authority to the principal alone or to the staff or to the superintendent, or it may retain it for itself. In the end, however, a curriculum must be properly authorized by formal action. The *nature* and the *importance* of any decision or command should determine whether it may best be authorized by a janitor, a clerk, a classroom teacher, the principal, an assistant superintendent, the superintendent, the board, the people by election or district meeting, or the legislature.

By nature and importance of the decision here, it is meant to stress the idea that authority is merely the right to put

the official stamp of approval upon the plan, the approval by which it is legally established, and to set it to its task. The reason why it matters who has that power is that, for a plan to be wise for use, the decision to adopt it should be made by one who is in a position to know whether it is as good as can be prepared. For a plan to be good means good for its own purposes and not detrimental to any of its own or any other purposes. Those who know when a curriculum is good would include teachers, principals, supervisors, and superintendents. All these people know the community and they know the theory and practice of learning and teaching. The teachers know something else of importance; they know the children who are to be the learners and are specialists in the needed subject matter. The superintendent knows some other important things, also, *viz.*, the cost, the housing, and the personnel implications of the curriculum. The board knows what the public is likely to accept as possible tax increase; it knows, too, how people feel about any provisions that are specially novel. Ideas of educational worth, ideas of cost, ideas of public attitude, all are important. So, we follow the practice of allowing the instructors and supervisors and research workers to plan the curriculum; we expect the central office to check it for expense of operation and general worth, and we expect the board to check it against public attitude and make the official decision to adopt. Here, knowledge did the work it should do, and authority approved and labeled it as the official curriculum. Thus are the authority and intelligence of director and directed brought together in practice.

Authority cannot be replaced by intelligence. In its next stage—direction proper—the process is still intellectual, in that choice of ways to apply the decision as an order has to be made; but here authority seems more in evidence, because this is the stage where action begins. The law or regulation can tell what is to be done, and often may indicate the major procedures for doing it. It can never cover details. At the point where details begin, the law ends and

discretion—rule by man—begins. In proportion as the law is general, direction is discretionary, action is not predetermined. But, if planning is well done, its effect is to extend the law and, so, to make direction that much less subject to personal whim or prejudice, and to guarantee that to this extent authority may not be used to do work that should be done by means of intelligence.

Even by the most careful extension of laws and rules possible through planning, however, the entire ground cannot be covered. Directing cannot be put into the hands of an automaton. It is a conscious act, a responsible service. It may act on prejudice or on careful judgment, with or without skill and discrimination. We cannot get on without it. Our control over direction, if it is too full and too direct, tends merely to take direction from one set of hands and put it into another. If we are to have the benefits of freedom to meet the unknown factors of situations as they arise, then we must take the risk of having our director play false or be inefficient.[21]

To divide direction in this stage, so that two people or a larger group or a committee might give orders, in place of one person, would mean to introduce a division of power and responsibility. This would slow the process and would make room for discord and insecurity. Division of authority and responsibility have been used with fine effect up to the point of giving orders for action. At that point, situations must be judged quickly, action must be touched off promptly, all concerned must feel that the die is really cast and that there is no turning back. Direction must set all hands to the task at once and give everyone a sense of being part of a team. Personalities differ and the manner of giving orders will differ accordingly. Life would be dull if we were all alike. If the law, the regulation, and the plan have settled the major matters, then surely we should be able—for the sake of speed and certainty, the basic essen-

[21] See Robert M. Cooper, "Administrative Justice and the Role of Discretion." *The Yale Law Journal,* 47:577–602, February, 1938.

tials—to entrust the directing, the command, to the intelligence, skill, and integrity of one person. Especially should this be true when division of authority could bring little good, at best, and might bring so much of harm.

The final end of the directing process—checking up—is mainly in the nature of control. In part, it is the beginning of replanning for the next orders. At this point, direction seems to reach into the activity we call inspection. That is, as direction proceeds, it keeps watch on the outcomes that result from its orders. This goes on step by step, from the start to the end of work. By seeing at each stage what outcomes his orders have produced, the director is enabled to vary his directions and, so, to keep a close fit of the directing order to the nature and needs of the situation and the work—the objective, the people, the process, the materials, and circumstances. Thus, the effects of direction tend constantly to double back upon direction and, in a manner, to advise it how to be continuously alert to the needs for succeeding orders. In this sense, inspection is direction's means of keeping its energy effectively focused upon its work.

Direction may at times have to compel; so it must use authority, as well as knowledge. This does not alter the fact that, as it moves step by step in its work, the giving of orders and the checking of results must keep alternating as before; because, whether authority operates as a compelling power or only as an official label, it must be continuously enlightened by its own outcomes.

It is not the intention to say that inspection here is direction and not control. The concern here is with what the directing process is like at the point of its contact with inspection. At this point it is peculiarly alert, self-examining, and reflective. It is, for the moment, reforming rather than directly ongoing. It is dealing with itself in its relation to its work, rather than with the work alone. It is a combination of self-criticism, reshaping itself, study of its job, and

direction, out of which comes a new, an up-to-date order.

There are many cases in which the inspection function should be a continuous, follow-up aspect of direction. Slight adjustments for a better fit are often possible to make as minor steps in redirection or as changes in direction. In many cases, the inspection should be participated in by those who execute, as well as by those who give, the orders. Suppose that a new form of report card should be developed (by joint efforts of teachers, principals, supervisors, and central-office executives) and be authorized for use by the superintendent, as of a given date. At the end of a term or a year, some review of results would be of value. Such a review could not be effective without the full cooperation of all who helped to make or helped to use the card. It is knowledge and experience, far more than authority, that count in inspection. Authority to inspect is necessary, but the inspection process itself is mainly intellectual.

When the subject is summed up, it appears that, at points in the directing process where the work is done by applying knowledge and skill, the processs can wisely be participated in by those who execute, as well as by those who decide and order; that is, at such points a division of authority and responsibility is consistent with the nature of the process that is required in the work. At other points in the process, where the work can be done only by application of authority, it is not consistent with the nature of the process to divide direction. On the other hand, in matters where decisions have to be final, prompt, and specific, and in terms of many factors not possible to anticipate in advance, a division of authority is sure to be unsteady and is likely to produce friction.[22] Those who would like to substitute committees, or groups, for our present system of executives

[22] This is not to be confused with the problem of the distribution of authority to the various offices throughout an organized system. Reference here is to one office or one unit or point in the total enterprise.

in school administration would do well to examine this analysis at greater length than is here possible. If the reasons for any method of government lie within the nature of the work to be done, of the ends sought, of the process to be used, and of the nature and capacity of those who use it, then the approach here suggested should be fruitful.

Chapter 5. COORDINATION AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

Here the term coordination is explained, especially in its relation to other elements of the administrative process, and reasons are given why such a function must inevitably arise in administration. Typical cases are suggested to illustrate the need for this service.

Needs for coordination are noted as arising from neglect to forestall difficulties by proper organization and planning, as well as from the effects produced by changes due to natural or any unforeseen developments. This leads to a study of how the functions of planning and organizing may be used to establish a sound basis for harmony in management and, so, to prevent the development of incoordinations; but also, how, even with their wisest use, they have not the capacity to prevent all misadjustments.

Since the function of coordination must be used, the inquiry turns to the question of how to effect it. For this, a distinction is made between the powers available for use and the actual measures taken to effect coordination. The nature and behavior of authority, knowledge, and will, as energizing powers, are examined for their uses and possible abuses. Each is shown to have limitations when alone, but in proper combination, to be strong. This analysis reveals how in many cases failure to effect coordination is due to a failure to use the form or combinations of forms of energy most appropriate to the task, one illustration of which is concerned with problems of morale.

After consideration of the forms of power, thought turns to an analysis of the coordinating process, as such. Three stages in the process are recognized. The first, diagnosis, has to do with discovery and study of the relationships in question; the second, prescription, with plans for effecting the coordinations; and the third, execution, with authorizing and directing action. The activities involved at each of these stages and the forms of power required are analyzed with a view to showing, step by step, how the process goes on from the beginning to the end. Though, in large part, the process is an intellectual one, it is partly social, partly legal, and partly individual in nature. Effectiveness in coordinating calls for insight—educational and social as well as managerial—for character and will power, and for discrimination in the use of the available forms of power.

1. *Coordination as an Aspect of Administration*

The term coordination. In Chap. 1 the administrative process was broken down into five major types of activity, one of which was called coordination. There this term was explained as referring to the task of bringing things together in harmonious relationship, to the end that they would function together effectively.

In administration one is dealing with people; with materials in endless variety; with educational purposes and programs; with children and parents; with the government; and with various physical, social, scientific, and economic forces. To carry on a school system requires a wide variety of activities, in which these various people, materials, interests, and forces each plays a part. The function of keeping each person, item of material, purpose, program, activity, interest, and force in its place and so attuned to all the others that together they form a unified, going educational enterprise is the function of coordination.

One could be working at coordination as one of his purposes even though he might be engaged in planning or in organizing or in directing or in controlling, as his primary

concern at the time. As one plans a budget, he must think of timing the collection to the spending of the funds, and the amounts of money provided in each case must match the estimated cost of the items of service or material they are to pay for. Budgeting is planning to have this desired harmony of relationship. Similarly, in directing, one does not give an order without careful thought of the various things that may be affected by it. In preparing the schedules for cleaning rooms, one cannot ignore the schedule of instruction. Again, in organizing, the size and assignments of staff are decided in terms of other things—the numbers of pupils, the instructional requirements, and the funds, the kind and amount of housing, and the instructional equipment available for use. In the field of administrative control, it is the same. An audit of the school funds is a checking of spending over against the budget and the income by sources, to determine whether income and expense are properly related to each other, not only as to amounts, but also as to use. The budget is both a collection of figures on income and expense and a plan or program of management for the schools. To control the funds, it is as important to check expense against the program carried out as to check it against income. Thus coordination is, in fact, an aspect or a phase of each of the other major forms of administrative activity.

Whether one thinks of this coordinating activity as his major task in any case or as only a phase of a larger problem is likely to be determined by the nature of the problem itself. Most problems in management require more than one form of managerial activity to solve them. What is important is that one shall be able to determine what kinds of activities to use and when and how to apply them. Here our concern will be to learn what we can of those activities by which harmony of relationships are established, maintained, or restored.

Distinctive character of this function. The reason for treating coordination as a separate phase of the administra-

tive process is not difficult to establish. The function is frequently and clearly needed and is easily distinguishable in practice. One may think of coordination either as an end or as a means; more often, perhaps, it is thought of as a process, a type of activity. A school system is a very complex institution. Wherever one looks, he sees many parts fitted together to form larger parts or wholes; he sees forces working together or reciprocally to achieve a common purpose; he sees processes complementing or supplementing other processes to produce some desired end. That someone must think of keeping the parts together and readjust them when they are out of place is an obvious necessity.

The parts of a school system do not go together of their own accord, nor are activities perfectly attuned to each other by chance alone. Furthermore, the relationship desired between parts is not equally obvious in all cases, and parts and processes once in harmony often get out of adjustment and, if not put back in place, may cause difficulty. Whether one is starting a school system anew or altering it, or repairing it, he must deal with this question of establishing, maintaining, or restoring its unity—unity of purpose, of structure, of process. To deal with unity is to deal with the relationships between parts of the whole, that is, with coordination.

Coordination provides a useful basis for evaluating one's actions in management. In setting up an objective for a sixth-grade course in geography, one cannot proceed in terms of geography content alone, but must consider how geography is to play a part in a wide program of social training. Geography is to contribute to training for citizenship, for homemaking, for understanding personal and public economy and problems of sanitation and public health, to mention a few of the major relationships by which we judge which geographical facts to include and how to arrange them. Besides these matters of subject matter, there are questions of using such geographical facts as can be understood by the children in question. A child's maturity, his

past experiences, his home and community life, his interests and abilities, all are involved. Then there is a third group of relationships, those having to do with how the children are housed, what are the teaching facilities available, and what are the instruction time and methods. In developing and managing a curriculum, one is concerned with all these relationships.

To carry this a step further, if one is administering a school system he will have to think of curriculum making when he is selecting and organizing his staff, when he is preparing his budget, when he is shaping policies affecting the government of the schools, when he is planning the housing for schools, when he is dealing with school-community problems. Everywhere his approach has to take account of the task of keeping parts adjusted to one another and to the whole. Thus, coordination becomes a part or a phase, not only of all forms of administrative activity, but of almost every task at which administration works. In a sense, it is a point of view by which one approaches every task and, later, a basis by which he evaluates what he has done. A matter of such importance should be separated out for special study. Such separate study need not duplicate work on other phases; rather, it should greatly enrich one's understanding of the other major forms of administrative activity.

2. *Approaches to a Study of Coordination*

Where coordination problems arise. To study coordination, one must be able, not only to recognize effective and poor coordination when he sees it, but also to discern where and when to apply the process in managing. When and where in administrative work must one think in terms of a harmony of relationships, as well as in terms of the particular items of business in hand? Or would it be better to turn this question about and ask, "When or where can one do anything in school management without thinking of how it must affect or be related to something else?"

To list all the points in a school system at which the relation of one thing to another is a matter of importance might be possible, but the list would be very long. Each item seems directly or indirectly related to almost every other item with which the administrator must deal, and the relationship is often important and complicated. Kindergarten work is related to that of grade one and, in places, to that of a nursery school; the function of teaching is related to that of guidance and to administration, to supervision, and to research; plans must be fitted to policies, and powers to duties, everywhere; properties, finance, and business must be developed and carried on with regard for the care and instruction of children and in terms of the will and financial capacity of the people.

Aspects of a coordination problem. Coordination in a given case may be in respect to time or to place or to any of many limiting circumstances within which the schools must operate; and it must be in respect to some end or objective or purpose to be served and, usually, to some scientific principle or to some special set of facts or conditions. That is, where two things are to be coordinated there is a reason why, and in this reason there will be found something to guide the actions to be taken. Study time, obviously, must precede recitation time. Sixth-grade studies anticipate those of grade seven. The budget is made before school opens. Or place is a factor, as when class size is determined by the size of rooms available, even though the nature of the instruction to be given and the number of pupils to be taught may also be involved. Where the playgrounds are limited, the work and recreation schedules of classes will have to be arranged to fit that special circumstance.

It is not enough to know merely that two things have to be brought together in time, or in respect to place or to some other attending circumstance. What is more important is the reason for it, the end to be served. Coordination in time or place is only in order to bring the parts to-

gether in a manner suitable for achieving the desired end. Often, to achieve a chosen end, action must be taken in terms of the dictates of science. The coordination of guidance with instruction requires not only a common purpose for teacher and counselor, but a careful application of the laws of learning by each. The end sought is learning and personality development, the means is teaching and guidance, the method is by careful application of psychological principles.

From this it seems clear that, to understand a case of coordination, one must know where, between what parts, a unity of action is desired; but beyond this, he must know the end toward which it aims and, with that, the means for and the method by which it can best be achieved.

Such a separate case approach to the study of coordination would have the advantage of concreteness, perhaps, and if pursued far enough, might lead to a classification of cases by which common elements would appear; and these, in turn, might lead to some principles by which one could see how to deal with cases.

Three factors involved in a coordinating problem. The necessary cases of coordination are not only endless in numbers but often they are complex in nature. In each problem of coordination there are three elements to be treated.

First, there are two or more parts or features of the school system that must be designed or arranged or operated in respect to each other. Courses must combine to form curriculums; purchase of teaching supplies must be fitted to size of classes, to time needed, and to methods of instruction.

Second, there must be some means by which these parts are held together. For this purpose we use, in some cases, law; in others, knowledge and skills; in others, social and professional norms; in others, personality and character. Receipts and expenditures are held to a proper relation to each other by the budget, which is a legal instrument. Courses and curriculums are shaped and administered to

fit educational objectives; and these, in turn, are shaped to fit the instructional needs of the children and the community. Such work involves the use of scientific knowledge first, even though law may be used later to give it authority. Laws and regulations may be essential to establish the relation of parts in the school organization; but without extensive and constant application of a knowledge of education, and without the use of professional ethics, social proprieties, and moral standards, any organization would quickly fall apart. However much these several forms of power may be used in shaping the parts, they are depended upon to hold the parts together.

Third, all parts and all the powers that operate to hold the parts together function in an environment, the various features of which must affect both the parts and the holding power of the cementing forces. Schools go on with respect to time, place, distance, physical facilities, and obstructions, and to many conditions and circumstances external to education. These are respects in which parts must be shaped to work together and in respect to which the cementing forces must hold them.

One may approach a study of administrative coordination by listing, classifying, and analyzing cases individually, as suggested above; he might approach it by a study of the adhesive forces, asking, "What parts, what kinds of things in administration can or must one bind together by use of law; in what kinds of cases must we depend upon knowledge and skill, or upon established social or professional usage, or upon personality and character and the wills of individuals? What combinations of these forces do we find and to what kinds of cases do such combinations apply?" To approach the study from the standpoint of our third element, environmental factors, might be equally useful as part of a scheme for analyzing cases, since, as noted above, most relationships between parts are in respect to time, space, place, distance, and often to physical objects and forces that may bar or facilitate action.

The difference between our second and third groups of factors lies in the fact that, to a large extent, we can and do shape and control the former, but over the latter we often have little control and, so, must learn how to adjust our purposes and activities to their requirements. We make the school laws and rules, and we formulate the policies, the plans and the directions through which the laws do their work. We bring stores of specialized knowledge and skill to our jobs, and at work we increase these powers by continuous study of problems as they arise. Our social, moral, and professional attitudes; our character; our will—all these are personal traits and powers and, within their limitations, are ours to use. Of the world outside, with its factors of time and space and climate and physical objects, it is different. These are, in a way, the dimensions of life. They limit or facilitate our work accordingly as our work adjusts or fails to adjust itself to them.

Two ways of viewing coordination. With the factors in the coordination process thus classified, there remains one other question. If organization does its work well, why is there ever a breakdown in that field? If policies are properly formulated, why do they seem at times to fail? If the functions of instruction, supervision, guidance, and research are properly conceived and established, why do we ever find them in conflict? This is merely asking, "Where, at what stage in school development is coordination supposed to do its work? Is it to be done at the beginning, as a phase of planning, organization, direction, control; or does it wait to be called in only when there is a case of misadjustment?" In the one case, the coordinating process seeks to prevent; in the other, to repair, bad relationships in the system. In the one, it is an aspect or a phase of the very beginning of any and every problem that involves relationships among the parts, the forces, processes, purposes, objects, with which administration is dealing; in the other, it is almost a separate function, an independent specialty with its own purposes, techniques, and methods.

To understand the nature of this phase of the administrative process, it will be necessary to examine all these matters at greater length and to consider how the various elements function in practice.

3. *The Study of Cases*

The field of study. Administration is concerned not only with the nature of its own direct purposes, mechanism and processes, as such, but especially with the work to which these are to be applied. It is responsible for all that combines to make up the schools. One cannot think intelligently about administration without thinking of what it is for, what service it is to administer. Administration does not do the teaching, but it provides the staff, the materials, the housing, and the arrangements for it. It may not make a curriculum; but it must know how one is made, be able to direct its making and to evaluate it when it is ready for use. It does these same things for all the services required in the schools. Accordingly, coordination has to deal with relationships, not in management alone, but within and among all the services.

Classification of cases. Within such a wide field, the number and variety of cases would be confusing unless there were some classification. As was suggested above in our definition, one could classify cases in terms of the kinds of administrative activity used. Some would fall under planning, others under organization, others under direction, and others under control. In a way—roughly—administration begins by planning; by thinking of what to do, how and when and where to do it, and what personnel and materials will be required. Planning is followed by actually setting up the organization or machinery called for in the plan. The next stage is direction, giving orders and instructions that will set the machinery in motion. The final stage of the administrative responsibility is the checkup, or evaluation, of what has been done. The service of coordination

can and obviously must be carried on at each of these levels, regardless of what the task is.

A second way of classifying cases might be by the function involved. What are the main relationships to be cared for when one is dealing with the function of supervision, or with guidance, research, health service, school cafeterias, curriculum making, library development, record and report systems, finance, building construction, playground equipment, business management, personnel work, public relations, clerical work, plant operation, and so on? Each of these could be further broken down. For instance, supervision is concerned with all the activities that have at all directly to do with improving instruction. Such matters as courses and curriculums, teaching equipment and supplies, housing of class groups, room furniture, in-service education of teachers, testing, teaching methods, library service, work programs of teachers and pupils—these are all the direct concern of supervision, and each of them is a special matter for each teaching group separately. To plan for supervision is to plan for a sound working relationship between supervision and each of these other services. In some cases, the breakdown could be in terms of separate projects, such as making a salary scale, preparing the floor plan for a school building, revising the social-studies part of a curriculum, or developing a system for personnel records.

An analysis and listing of coordination problems in this manner would be a useful experience for any administrator. By experience and training, a teacher thinks of sixth-grade geography or of Biology I or of English A in terms of a body of facts, principles, and skills that have been developed, as such; he thinks in numerous ways of his own group of students and their development, of the school calendar, of his teaching facilities, probably, of tests and promotion rules, and of his own work assignment. The teacher's view is a very important view to bring to curriculum work, but it is not the only one. All learning is by individuals and in terms of individual ability, interest, and effort. This fact

must be applied in teaching and in curriculum making. Yet, with great numbers to teach the group, interest cannot be ignored. Nor is it the class or the school group, alone, that is important. When a child has completed a program, this fact must be recognizable in a tangible way if it is to serve him as a means of getting on, either in school or in life. Then, there is the view of the state and of our society as a whole. There is no sharp line to separate the individual interests from the social and governmental interests. Obviously, they interlock for us in endless ways. But they also conflict, at times. To serve education in our country, all these views must find a place in curriculum making, and somehow the various interests must be harmonized.

To take a smaller problem: Where would coordination come into the task of preparing a report card? First, there is a purpose—to convey information from the school to the parent. The card is a means of communication, in the nature of a letter. Second, the content of this letter must be of a nature and of a tone and style to evoke and facilitate cooperation between parent and teacher. Third, the card must be of a quality, form, and arrangement of content suited for available means of transmission, suitable for filing, and suitable for ready consultation as a record. Finally, rules governing its preparation, transmission, filing, use, and custody have to be thought of. All together, it is apparent that even so small an item as a report card calls for recognition of at least a dozen separate factors. The principal and his superiors, the teacher, the parent and the child have separate but direct interests in this project. Each of these interests must be served, and none must be injured. Then, less directly but importantly, the public has an interest; for this card has a status with the government and the people as an authentic public record. In deciding the content, the form, the use of this card, all these interests must be harmonized.

In thus analyzing cases by referring only to their separate parts and to relationships, it is not meant to leave out the

other two aspects of each case, *viz.*, the forces or means that hold the parts to their places, and the environmental factors with reference to which the separate elements in any case must be treated. The procedure is merely to put first things first. The first question is What are the parts, the processes, the forces, that must be or must operate together? Only when this is decided can the question of ways and means and the question of outside circumstances arise.

4. *Coordination in Advance and as Remedial Treatment*

Two types of cases. Before leaving the idea of a case study of coordination, a study by analyzing cases as they appear in practice, the idea of advanced vs. remedial treatment of cases calls for further consideration. It has been suggested that in planning, organizing, directing, and controlling, one is constantly dealing with coordination. As one plans and organizes, he tries to anticipate and forestall difficulties that might arise if parts were not properly placed with reference to each other. In directing, one may so shape his command or instructions that he will forestall incoordination or, in another case, remedy an incoordination.

Clearly, the more difficulties one is able to foresee and plan for, the fewer there will be to treat as such. History and common-sense observation tell us for a certainty, however, that for our changing world the best of plans and schemes of organization soon find themselves out of alignment with the needs. This element of change—change by force of discovery and invention; by growth, shifting, or other population changes; by wars and disasters—goes on and on, and to these changes all elements of our culture are forced to adjust themselves, or else eventually they decay and disappear. Contrast the school of today with that of a century ago—numbers and types of children, the curriculum, the books and equipment, the school plant, the education of teachers, teaching methods—wherever one looks, the contrast is sharp. Our knowledge of psychology, sociology, biology, health, physical development, sanitation—sciences

basic to a knowledge of the educative process—have grown and, at the same time, changes have come in our modes of life in the home, the community, the nation and the world at large, creating a vastly different set of social ends toward which the school must direct its efforts.

Change in any enterprise, then, is normal because it is inevitable. To find the parts of a school out of adjustment may be evidence of these normal changes and not at all of poor original plans and organization. As long as administration has to deal with this element of change, it will have to expect its best plans in time to go awry.

Even so, prevention is better than cure for social as well as for physical ills. This only reminds us, however, that in all its phases administration is a continuous process. We plan, but soon we must replan. We organize and, later, reorganize. We direct and then redirect. Also, we coordinate and, later, take things apart and put them together in new ways. This is the nature of administration in a dynamic culture.

Whether one is starting with an entirely new problem of coordination or is rearranging the parts in an old one, the task is much the same if one thinks of administration as the process of keeping orderly and purposeful a great number of changing elements in a moving current of materials, circumstances, and events. But coordination has, in most cases, to do with people as well as with aims, materials, ideas, procedures, programs, time, place, and the like. When one undertakes to establish or to rearrange the relationships among people, he finds it necessary to take account of the interests and attitudes and feelings of the people in question. People cannot be moved about as one shifts scenery or moves chessmen.

In establishing relationships anew and with new people, there are no vested interests, no crystallized attitudes, no traditions, no precedents, no prejudices, no faces to save, that would tend to cling to the past of the enterprise in hand. Each employee will have interests, habits, and prej-

udices, perhaps, but as such they can have had no previous connection with the new undertaking and, so, employees can be expected to face all problems with reasonably open minds. Where coordination is concerned with the revision of relationships to bring them up to newer needs, or with repair of relationships that have broken down, the situation is likely to be different. Here, in addition to getting a clear picture of the problem and of the solution, there is the task of breaking the hold of the old habits, attitudes, vested rights, and prejudices that stand against the development of the new scheme of relationships and against the growth of the new skills and feelings of responsibility so essential to the new scheme of coordination.

Coordination in advance. If we are to recognize coordination, both as a phase of other administrative activities and as an independent function, working, in the one case, to create and, in the other, to repair or adjust relationships, then, since the problem is substantially different in the two cases, it would seem necessary to examine cases of the two types separately.

Only when a school district is being formed or expanded does one have opportunity to see the problems and the different phases of school administration at their beginnings. First, in forming a district, the people enact a law, creating a district; second, a lay board is elected to put the law into effect; third, the board chooses a superintendent to direct the work of forming and operating the schools. To some extent, administrative action is defined in the law. This the board particularizes by special acts, decisions, orders, or general policies. Beyond this, decision of matters rests with administration. To carry out the law and the board's instructions, the superintendent must find or develop housing; select a staff; formulate a program; organize schools, classes, staff, and program; and provide working facilities. Each of these items is to be a part of a school system and, so, must be designed for its special place in the scheme of things.

A school system is not a miscellaney of items. It is an

organization, in which parts are carefully joined together. One does not employ teachers merely as teachers, but as teachers trained for special kinds of work. He does not organize classes merely by assigning pupils to seats or to rooms, but, especially, with reference to the kinds of instruction needed and the teaching requirements of that instruction. In planning a building, the starting point is not finance, architecture, and engineering; but rather, instructional needs. Suitable shelter, numbers and sizes and needs of the children to be housed, kinds of work to be included in the program, organization of the work schedules, teaching facilities required, safety and care of the children, all are important elements. No one of these alone, but all together, furnish the key to what funds and what structure to plan for.

Thus coordination is not only a question of what things belong together, but also, of what is to determine the relationship. Housing and instruction are not likely to be properly coordinated if we design the building and then try to put the classes and activities into it. Supervision and research are not likely to be coordinated for service to teaching if they are so separately administered that neither attempts to suggest anything to the other, or if each is managed without participation by teachers. Business and instruction are likely to lack coordination if purchasing is directed in terms of the purchasing agent's notion of economy, instead of in terms of the teacher's notion of instructional needs.

As is shown repeatedly in other chapters of this book, the principle that serves best in the work of administration is not brought in from the outside but is derived from a study of the nature of the work itself. The business economy just mentioned is by no means unimportant in managing schools; but saving money on a purchase is misleading if it results in the purchase of materials that cost less but that are not suited to the work. One can carry out elaborate systems of tests, analyze the results, and prepare records and reports

of findings; but if all this is not done with reference to a clear purpose to apply the results to teaching and to curriculum work, it likely will have been more a waste than a benefit. To make sure that the results will be so used, thought must be given in advance to all the factors that must be brought into harmony. For such research results to benefit instruction, the whole procedure must have been an interest and a responsibility of teachers, as well as of researchers or executives or supervisors. Unless coordination is effected at the beginning in such a case, there is doubt whether it can later be made effective.

From this it is clear that, for one to decide how two or more functions are to be coordinated, he must be sure of the end or ends to be served and understand the nature of the functions that are to be brought together. To understand the nature of functions is not only to know their objectives—what they are for—but also to know the processes involved, the people (teachers, children, officers) who are to perform, and the materials that are to be used, all in relation to the project.

Coordination in advance presents a slightly different situation when there is a past to consider. If, instead of developing a new school system, one is adding a new unit to a growing system—a nursery school, a junior college, a research department, a division of school-plant planning—the situation would be slightly but importantly different. In case of the new district, the advance consideration of how to coordinate the parts and processes had no past to consider, no established objectives or way of life to build upon or to extend. In expanding an existing system by adding a distinctly new feature, there is a past to consider. The nature and purpose of the new feature will likely meet with difficulty if, by its operations, it introduces substantial changes in the existing enterprise. This past is a very real thing to those in charge of the schools. It consists of an established way of life in the school system—accepted purposes, operative routines, concepts of efficient work, and personal and

professional relationships involving rights and duties and social standing. This going enterprise is very firmly related to each teacher's concept of his own position. A position is not merely a set of rights and responsibilities, it is more than this and more than work and pay. It embodies personal attitudes and habits, professional aspirations and hopes, and social status. Whoever or whatever alters this existing way of life will have to give a good account of itself. Adding a nursery-school unit might jostle the existing scheme of things very little, but in so far as it showed prospects or even possibilities of doing this, it would be scrutinized with care.

To see this element (call it love of status quo or—with less cynicism—sense of personal concern or sense of unity in the institution) in a little clearer way, let us suppose that the change is not by way of adding a separate unit but that it involves substantial alteration of existing purposes or programs or structure or processes and, so, changes the existing status (rights and duties, possibly, professional status) of members of the staff. Then this element of balance, this sense of unity, these personal and professional hopes are really disturbed. Each member of the staff may try to weigh the proposed alterations in terms of educational needs, but all will weigh them, also, in terms of what the changes may do to their own positions. Each person will weigh his own interests in light of the two views together, or against each other if they are unlike, and will take a stand. This stand becomes a factor, pro or con, in effecting the alteration. If a great majority approve, the alteration can be made without breaking down more coordinations than are constructed. If the persons affected have not been consulted, or if any have been adversely affected by the change and no consideration has been given to that fact, then, to that extent, forces, incipient potentials for incoordination, have been formed.

Coordination as repair work. In working with problems of coordination in a new situation, there is no past of vested

interests, no long-practiced or treasured way of life, to be disturbed. When a distinct new unit is added to a going system, the old and established relationships are but little disturbed. When, instead of a separate item's being added, there is substantial alteration involved—the aim still being expansion, to care for growth or new developments—the established way of life is much more disturbed. However, since alteration carries no suggestion of a breakdown, there is no stigma and, so, no fear of change. There is yet one other class of case which may be provoked by growth or scientific change, but which involves also, another element. This, we may refer to as cases of failure or breakdown.

A breakdown can come from many causes—the ignoring of change, incompetence, indifference, lack of means—and in many forms, such as poor results, friction, low staff or student morale, and complaints and demands from the public. In such cases, the difficulty may be one of poor coordination alone, but it is more likely to be also weaknesses in one or more of the parts themselves—the purposes, programs, staff, equipment, procedures, housing—all, in some degree controllable by the management.

Each case of breakdown represents a special combination of weaknesses, and the necessary remedy usually must involve the relationships. In such a case, the old way of life is severely shaken and each of those reassigned to a part will have to develop a new picture of the enterprise and participate in building a new way of life, both for himself and for the enterprise. The task of coordination in such a case, the task of developing sound relationships between persons and between services, involves the breaking down of the old patterns of thought and behavior, as well as the developing of new ones. When, for any individual, this is merely a problem of learning, there may be little difficulty. But if the breakdown or the reconstruction has disturbed the emotional elements, the case is more complicated. Broken morale is hard to mend, because emotion competes with reason for control of decisions.

This series of cases throws some light upon the nature of the element of coordination. First, from the cases here examined, one might infer that the function is required at almost every turn in administration—this, for the reason that, in almost every problem, one has to deal with several separate parts or interests that must function together. Second, this not only makes coordination a phase of each of the other administrative functions, but reveals how coordination may function in advance (in preparing plans, in setting up organizations, in forming and giving directions, and in establishing controls) to assure effective relationships and, so, to forestall breakdowns. Third, this series of cases reveals how, in its simplest form, in a new project, coordination is almost entirely a matter of fact and logic; but how it becomes increasingly complex as it works with older and more firmly established relationships; and how it grows more complex, also, as its work involves more and more changes in the established relationships. Fourth, when coordination deals with a breakdown, there is one new element to deal with. Here the change to be introduced stamps the old as defective. Along with other defects in breakdowns, one usually finds the established way of life in the project emotionalized. Morale is low, everyone seems on the defensive, and there is little will to cooperate. In such a case, one cannot rely upon fact and reason to hold things together. In such cases, coordination may have to wait until direction has applied surgery.

This reveals a wide field wherein the process of coordination must function. It shows that the tasks it has to deal with range from the very simple, in which the situation is new and impersonal, to the extremely complex, in which personalities, vested interests, established habits have to be disturbed. In all these cases, coordination can be singled out and worked upon separately as a special problem, even though it is rarely if ever the sole concern of administration in any case. This is merely noting the obvious, but often overlooked, fact, that the parts of an institution have to be

designed with regard for the necessary relationships among them, and that the nature of each part in no small way determines that part's capacity to function with other parts. Coordination must study parts, therefore, as well as relationships. It must be within the nature of any part to function with other parts, not independently or in spite of those parts.

5. *The Forces by Which Coordination May Be Effected*

A second approach to the study of coordination. If funds are readily available for purchase of teaching supplies and equipment as they are needed, there is said to be coordination between budget and instruction. If children are doing well in their school studies and activities, and if the curriculum is well suited to needs and the teaching is of good grade, and if there is sound morale in the staff, it is reasonable to assume that there is coordination between supervision and teaching. If one sees a research staff at work on the development of some complicated devices for measuring the results of instruction, but among the teachers finds little interest in and little training for that approach to the task of improving instruction, he would likely conclude that there was little coordination between research and teaching. If one looks for a book of rules and regulations or for a salary schedule or for an organization chart or for a marking system or for a work program or for a card catalogue to the library, and finds nothing, he would have to conclude that the administration was very short on devices for holding the parts of the school system together.

This suggests a second approach to the study of coordination. What is the nature of the force or the device that holds the parts together in harmony? What is wrong or lacking when parts seem not to function harmoniously? It is not enough to say that when parts or processes must function together we must design them to fit together. The question is, How may we do this? By what principle may we design the parts in advance, or rearrange or redesign

them if they fail to fit? If properly made, will they continue to work well together, or must they be held by some force or by the action of some special device?

Above, in our analysis of cases, note was taken of this aspect of the coordination problem. Law, knowledge, social forces, and personality were listed as the available forces or influences or forms of energy, available for holding things together in a system. Unless one takes a purely mechanistic view of administration, these forces must be regarded as important elements in coordination activity. As such, they call for study. Law as a statute or a rule is one thing; as an energizing force, a restraining or a directing power, it is different. Similarly, knowledge, social custom, professional ethics, and personal taste or will become important in management as soon as they begin to energize and influence decision and action.

Forms of power and devices for applying power. For a fuller consideration of the nature of these forms of power, the reader may turn to Chaps. 2, 7, and 8. It may serve the purpose here to think of law as the authority by which public schools exist; also, as the will of the people for whom the schools operate. The one view is legalistic; the other, more broadly social. By social forces as powers for coordinating, reference here is to customs, conventions, proprieties, traditions, beliefs, common aspirations, forms of speech, moral standards, and professional ethics. Laws have their roots deep down in these social forces.[1] By knowledge, here, reference is to the factors involved or affected when action or decision goes forward on a rational plane, that is, by the use of fact, reason, and special skills in planning for or in adjusting relationships in the system. Personality as a

[1] Legal authorities are not in full agreement on this question of the origin of law; but since concern here is with making and administering laws to give expression to the wishes of the people, and not with the refinements of legal definition, it is a helpful point of view. See James Barr Ames, "Law and Morals," *Harvard Law Review*, 22:97–113, December, 1908. Also Frederick R. Coudert, *Certainty and Justice*. New York: D. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1914.

factor may be or may operate as a social force, but it is more than this, for it is—at least, in part—as readily wielded upon oneself by its possesser as is law or knowledge. A zealous person may effect coordinations by his enthusiasm and will to succeed when, without that personality trait of determination, he would fail to get harmony.

These forms of power probably do not exist wholly apart from each other and in pure form. Often each must be a part of all the others. As law grows out of the customs and common ideas and hopes of the people, so personalities are formed under the influence of both the laws and the customs of the time. Laws could not have been formed without the use of knowledge, and the knowledge that is available in any culture is, in part, dictated by the culture and not solely by the facts and the laws of science. The fact of this interlocking—that is, the inseparability of these forces in practice—reveals an important aspect of their natures. Recognizing these relationships should increase our capacity for applying the forces in management.

Devices for applying the power of law. As a force, law exists as principles. To bring law into use, we must embody it in special form. So we enact statutes, rules, regulations, orders, directions, forms for records or procedures, and the like, each being applicable to special situations. The law compels attendance, the rule defines how experience is to be used as a basis for fixing salaries, the requisition form shapes the request for purchase of materials. These forms are but the instruments or devices through which the power of the law is brought to bear in specific cases. In these and many other forms, the law is used to define and establish relationships, as well as to *direct* or to *control* the school.

If one tries to think of devices for bringing law to bear as a coordinating force, many parts of the school machinery come to mind. A number of these devices have been mentioned above. The budget, the curriculum, the book of rules and regulations, the salary schedule, the organization chart, the library card catalogue, any contract, or a job as-

signment, the system of records, the daily work schedule, the child's report card, the school calendar—all these are illustrations, and one could continue to add to this list of devices. Each of these is a legal instrument, in the sense that use of it is officially authorized and can be enforced.

All these devices come alive when action involves the rights or responsibilities they establish, when it involves use of the meanings they establish or the actions or decisions they authorize. Any one of these devices is quiescent, as if it did not exist, until circumstances touch it off, whereupon it dominates performance. A good coordinating device will facilitate the flow of authority to the task of welding parts together; a bad one may retard or prevent this flow.

Devices for applying knowledge. What has been said of devices or instruments as means of bringing legal power into action applies, in much the same way, to knowledge, as well. The legal device could hardly compel if it did not also inform. A statute, a rule, a contract, a record, or a report form must convey information as well as legal compulsion. Probably nine-tenths of the legal instruments used in schools function primarily as directions or instructions, rather than as orders or legal notices or demands.

A library card is an information device purely. There is no suggestion of legal power in it. By use of it one can find the most obscure book in the library in a few minutes. The pupil's cumulative record card is primarily a source of information, though the facts recorded may have legal status as official records. The curriculum is an official document; as such, it embodies regulations that will be enforced if necessary, but its content and arrangement are designed as much for conveying information to teachers and students about how to plan and carry on instruction programs, as they are for regulating the courses—or even more so. Supervisors could not function without the constant development and use of knowledge. To develop and apply this knowledge, they use many temporary as well as more permanent devices. Their efforts must interlock with the

efforts of teachers, librarians, and counselors. This interlocking cannot be on the basis of authority alone; it must be on the basis of knowledge. A work program, a counselor's records, a teacher's class book, or children's reports, tests, outlines of courses, and health records are some of the devices through which knowledge is built up and held available for use in keeping supervision attuned to instruction.

Devices for use in bringing social and personal powers to bear upon coordination. With social and personality powers the situation is somewhat different. A tradition, a custom, a propriety, or a moral standard does not have to be defined or set down in print to be remembered. These are social inheritances, they are characteristics or qualities of ourselves. Existing as beliefs or prejudices or habits or conscience, they shape our responses to stimuli much as do our minds. We unavoidably respond to people and to situations in terms of these ways of life and of the values that this inheritance stands for. Thus it is that we feel pride or shame for what we have done. When these social standards conflict with personal desires, there may be cases in which conscience is set aside. In defying custom and proprieties one can go pretty far to offend peoples' feelings before he has offended legally, but he cannot go very far before he has offended his own sense of what is right or decent or in good taste. These social forces hold powerful sway over us and we make constant use of them in dealing with others.

With personal traits it is the same. We, as men among men, are the instruments through which the power of personality is brought to bear. Personality is social as well as biological in its origin and nature; it functions as an influence in society because it influences and convinces people. One's capacity and will to cooperate, to see another's viewpoint, and to follow as well as to lead have much to do with his ability to keep his work attuned to that of others.

How law may be used in coordination. How these forms

of power may be used to achieve coordination depends upon their natures. It is not in the nature of string to hold the parts of a ship together; nor can wishes or dreams or pretty phrases, alone, hold the parts of a state together. Only in proportion as law, knowledge, social forces, and personality can be used to bind the parts of a school system together and to harmonize the actions of its parts, are they of interest here.

The authority of law is not in a statute or an administrative order, as such, but in the physical power of the state. The statute is but a form to evidence the existence of the will to use authority and to specify its use in a given type of situation. The public school is created by law. Every part and process of the system has authority back of it. The authority available for use in any case is available in amount and form suited to the work it is to perform. The board of education has power to lay taxes, to contract for buildings and services, to adopt or reject programs of instruction; the teacher has power to give instruction, to manage his pupils and his program; the clerk has power to keep records and file documents and take dictation; the executive has power to command others within his province and within the limits of laws and the instructions of his superiors. The pupil and the parent participate with the law to ensure their rights to special places in the total enterprise.

The variety of ways in which the power of law must be brought to bear in a public school system, in order that it may function in these different directions, reveals how fluid, how adaptable it must be. Too many get the idea that law is the special possession of executives, that its sole function is to command or to enforce commands. This is clearly a false notion. There is no more and no more powerful law at work in a command than there is in the act of teaching, or of counseling, or of supervising. Law energizes each function in accordance with its nature and needs.

The power of law may accomplish its purpose in one case

by defining an end to be achieved, or a form of organization or a procedure to be used. In another case, it may have to add to this a penalty for nonconformance. There is a wide range of cases that lie between these extremes. It is in the nature of law to be applied in a manner to fit the needs of the case. School-attendance laws often provide for use of penalties. Laws that define what shall be taught in the schools provide explanation to guide, but no special penalty for nonconformance. Wherever there is law, however, any action not in conformance is automatically not protected by law. This fact has a restraining influence on conduct.

There are many matters that can be dealt with properly only when one has studied them at the time, in the place, and under the circumstances in which they may appear. For such cases laws are general, leaving details to be settled by administrative decision. Thus, the law gets extended at many points by persons in office. When the authority of the law is discretionary, people tend to react, not to the law, but to the person who administers it. Thus law, social standards, knowledge, and personality elements tend to combine to function as the authority of law.

Since the authority of law may be applied either as an impersonal and compelling force or largely as a guide or source of information to be used in a plan of working together or, often, to a large extent, as a personal right or power, there arises the question of when and where to use one or another of these three ways of applying the authority of law as a means of coordination. If one tries to compel two people to work together in intimate ways when, in fact, they are out of agreement as to purposes and procedures and personally dislike each other, the cooperation will lack something, however letter perfect it may be as to form. Some coordinations are of a nature not to be harmed by this, but others would soon be destroyed by it. Should one try to produce cooperation between the functions of administration and teaching by legally compelling it? Could

guidance be coordinated with teaching, or with health service, or with research, or with supervision, by force of legal penalties? Or how far would knowledge and social usage and ethics go in arranging and enforcing contracts for buildings or with employees? They would go far in safeguarding all rights involved in a teacher's contract, perhaps, but certainly not all the way. Could one command a teacher to see that sixth-grade work anticipates that of grade seven? Obviously, there are wise and foolish ways of using authority as a means of getting unity of action in a school system.

How knowledge may be used to effect coordination. Above, note was taken of how knowledge, as collections of facts, may be arranged for special devices and used to hold parts or functions together in a school system. As noted, there are many such devices in use. Here, concern is with the nature of knowledge as a coordinating force. By what power does knowledge effect cooperation and how may we use it? As the physical power of the state is the power behind the law, so in a parallel way we may say that the power of truth, of science, of logic gives force to knowledge. We do not defy facts or sound reasoning. When facts are brought to bear properly in the management of schools, we not only accept them as facts but they go far toward revealing our duties in our work, and they often reveal how the duty should be met. To some extent, we know in advance what knowledge we shall need in our work and we shape devices for assembling it. In other cases, this need can be found only by a study of the problem when it arises.

Besides the knowledge of facts and of scientific method that one brings to his work as a professionally trained person, there is constant need for facts about the case in hand. This more specific and intimate knowledge of problems must be developed in advance or as need arises. Advance training provides the indispensable perspective and tools for developing and interpreting the latter. There is still one other matter. People usually can agree as to facts; but as to what facts apply in a given case, or as to the values with

reference to which facts are to be assembled or interpreted, they can very often disagree. We only have to review the discussions of democracy in school administration, or those bearing upon the freedom of teaching, to see how people can choose or manipulate facts to fit their preferred ideas of ultimate values or ends. Thus, knowledge often leads to debate, where fact and opinion or fact and fancy become so entangled that both lose the power they normally should exercise over our conduct.

In trying to use knowledge as a means of producing or of maintaining harmony in management, it would seem wise to consider not only what facts we are planning to use, but especially, the ends with reference to which we choose and evaluate facts as our guide. Two teachers might use the same body of fact in teaching the subject of farm cooperatives. If in one case the interest were to indoctrinate the students with the ideas of socialism and, in the other, to examine the processes of cooperatives as a feature of the democratic way of life, the outcomes would be very different—so different that one could hardly speak of the two classes as having taken the same course. In such a case, the course of study, as a device for coordinating the parts of a student's program, would seem to have a serious defect. It did not clear up the important question of the aims of the course. The result was that, in both classes, the students learned less than they might have learned and quite likely may have developed erroneous ideas—erroneous, because incomplete as to the nature and significance of cooperatives. If the cumulative record—a device for coordinating instruction, guidance, health service, and administration—is incomplete, then cases of discipline, of promotion, of failures, and of conflict in work schedules may be settled in defiance of the most important facts of the case. Before a coordinating device, such as a cumulative record card, is prepared, care should be taken to determine what it is to be used for, who is to use it, and what facts it must include in order to meet these needs.

How social forces may be used in coordination. Since by traditions, customs, proprieties, moral standards, and professional ethics, we mean the accepted ways of life (including both the forms of behavior and the values with reference to which these forms have developed), the question here is how these forces operate and how we may use them as means of keeping parts or processes together in management. It must be kept in mind not only that these forces have helped to shape our own personalities and characters and, so, our attitudes and tastes, our beliefs, and our prejudices, but also that they are reflected in our institutions, in all their purposes, structural parts, and processes. Everywhere, these exist as characteristics or qualities or viewpoints or habits of people. We know people in large part by the way their patterns of behavior reflect the accepted standard ways of life. We depend upon these patterns as much or more than we do upon people's names or signatures, as means of identifying them.

The fact that this entire pattern is built up from the past does not mean that it is not reasonably well adapted to current social purposes and needs. It is a product of evaluation, and the elements most fit have tended to survive. In that sense, it is the best possible way of life. However, it is not the nature of tradition or habit or any fixed element of culture to make new discoveries. Its power is the power to preserve, not to create. Its value in culture is its power to stabilize, to make relationships consistent and continuous. Without this element of continuity, there would be instability and, finally, conflict and social chaos. It is to this source that we must look for some of the most important of the elements that make for orderly life in society.

On the other hand, it is the nature of science to discover, to create, and to explain. By its work it may point to new ways of life and thereby stimulate and enrich the culture. Often it may support the traditional way of life. At times, however, science points to defects in the existing way of life and, by its influence, tends to break down the old way.

There are those who become so interested in the new way that they come to think of all old ways as decadent and bad. This is unwise and very far from true. Stability is as important as change. We could no more survive in a state of continuous flux, in which nothing is socially stable, than we could in a purely static culture that defied all change.

In management, this culture pattern, of which our professional ethics is a specialized feature, is depended upon to hold the school mechanism together, to hold all practice true to the science (then known) that underlies it. It is the culture pattern, more than law or knowledge, that stabilizes the school and keeps its energies going true to purpose. For one to defy the standards of this accepted way of life is to invite social and professional ostracism, an experience as damaging to the ego as is any legal condemnation. Thus it is that we may speak of social power in administration, as we do of the power of law or of science.

How personality may be used to effect coordination. Coordination may be a matter of direct working relationships between persons, or it may be a question of purely physical arrangement of objects, or it may be a partly objective and partly personal relation, an adjustment between two relatively independent services. The counselor and the teacher of a given class must work together. Each must know the most intimate facts about the other's work if the children are to have proper care and instruction. Such collaboration cannot be effected by rules defining duties or by orders commanding cooperation. Professional ethics and social propriety may compel to some extent, but it cannot be counted upon to produce genuine cooperation if the teacher and the counselor happen to dislike each other. Without scientific equipment for their work, they will not be able to cooperate with great wisdom, though this lack may not interfere with their willingness to do so.

Where one is attempting to coordinate matters that are purely objective—preparing a building program in which cost and kind of building needed have to be brought to fit

each other—personality may not greatly help or hinder, except perhaps to speed up the work when personal relationships among workers are pleasing, or to slow it down when they are unpleasant. Since the decisions must depend upon facts, the end sought will likely be arrived at. When it is a question of personal cooperation, the situation is different. In such cases, the kind of coordination needed can rarely be attained if personalities tend to clash and is greatly facilitated if the relations are harmonious.

In staffing a project, the administrator will do well to consider to what extent, in what ways, upon what matters, and with whom the occupant of this position may have to work in close personal relationship. Knowing this—that is, knowing the demands of the position—he should be able to avoid many pitfalls. If cooperation is required between two persons, one should not be domineering if the other is specially retiring; one should not be a cynic and the other highly sincere and sensitive; one should not be an ambitious climber and the other a mere job holder.

Personality is a factor in nearly all parts of school work. The school is a society in which people live and work and play together. Much of what a teacher, a principal, or a superintendent does through the day is done in cooperation with or in respect to the work or interests of other persons. One's personality has much to do with the responses other people will make to what one does. To two identical propositions, one made by a pleasing personality, the other by a disagreeable personality, the response of a group will be widely different. If in the former case the proposition is rejected, the rejection will be offered with respect and propriety. If in the latter case it is accepted, the acceptance decision will be made with hesitation.

6. *The Nature of the Coordinating Process*

The elements involved—a résumé. So far, this analysis has attempted to find out what elements are involved in a coordination problem and something of the nature of these

elements; it has examined the elements separately and as they appear in combination in typical cases in which coordination is called for. It has revealed that the problem of handling relationships is coextensive with that of handling the parts of a school system—the personnel, materials, purposes, procedures, programs, methods, policies—because every item used in a school system is used in conjunction with other items and must, therefore, be kept attuned to others. Up to this point, conclusions sum up as follows:

By the nature of a school system, problems of coordination must inevitably represent a major concern in all the services, separately and together, throughout the system. Of a school system there are many parts and many specialized services, each of which is so joined to others that, together, they form a unified going concern. Building a school system would not be difficult if one had only to select what things to use, but it becomes extremely difficult when one considers how these items are to be fitted together and how the behavior of each item must be attuned to that of other items.

Teaching, research, guidance, supervision, health work, clerical work, engineering and architectural service, library work, care and upkeep of plant, each represents a large field of activity. It is the business of administration to see that these services function and that they function together, in harmony. Each of these has its special personnel, its special place of work, its special equipment and supplies. Each has its objectives, its organization, its program, its equipment, its methods of work; and each turns out its special product.

Such numbers of people, working with so many materials and in such specialized ways, can achieve unity of effort only if they are able to fit their purposes and efforts together and hold them to their chosen courses. If all are to work together, each person must know how his own work fits in with that of his colleagues; each group must understand the connection between its own service and those of other

groups. To make this possible, there must be a basis of common understanding, a practical procedure for effective cooperation, and a means of holding these relationships true, once they have been decided upon.

It was shown above that law, knowledge, social usage, and personality are the available forms of power that can be used, separately or together, but each in its own special ways, to fix and maintain the coordinations required between parts, processes, purposes, and objects in a going enterprise. In this connection it was shown, too, that coordinations can be broken down by trying to use one of these four types of energy when the nature of the case required a different one.

It was shown, also, that many coordinations may be worked out in advance, when the project is in the planning or organizing stage, thereby anticipating later problems of rearrangement or repair. In case there is growth in an enterprise, however, or in case change is made necessary by scientific developments or by new interests, the work of coordination must involve rearranging and, sometimes, substantial alterations. This, in turn, may necessitate discard of old elements and the introduction of entirely new ones. Such new ones may be more difficult to introduce because they disturb vested interests or long-established routines and habits and ways of thinking about the work.

The basis upon which coordination is called for was shown to vary from case to case. It might be in respect to time or place or special circumstances of environment. It must be in respect to a special objective, to the achievement of which the combined parts are to contribute. It might be in terms of the methods used or of the materials or of the programs. Thus, end, means, and method, are essential aspects of all coordination problems.

Major divisions of the coordination process. If in the above text we have brought to light the nature of all the different elements involved in a coordination problem, it should be possible to develop a procedure for diagnosing and treating cases; that is, for administering coordinations.

In doing this, it will be necessary to keep in mind that coordination as prevention differs somewhat from coordination as cure; and also that the nature of any one element in a case is to be seen in the way it behaves, as well as in what it appears to be as an object or purpose or process, or person. That is, coordination must be understood as a process besides being recognized as a relationship that exists as a fact.

The school administrator is not merely a consultant—one who is called by sick patients. He is a responsible director of affairs. It is his responsibility to discover cases in which coordination is needed and, as far as possible, to do this in advance of the need, his object being to prevent incoordination from arising. When such conditions have arisen, however, it is his duty to treat them by introducing any alterations that are required for restoring harmony among the parts or processes involved.

The process of coordination, as actual administrative work, divides naturally into three types of activity—diagnosis, prescription, and execution. In administration one finds out what is wrong in a case, or what will be required in a case yet to be developed, in order that he may be able to correct the weakness or, in the new case, to forestall weaknesses. Thus, diagnosis is the first stage and prescription, the second stage of this type of administrative activity. Only upon completion of these two can one deal with the final step, which is to give effect to the plan.

The nature of these three forms of activity can be seen by considering what they involve and how one might proceed in carrying them out.

The work of diagnosis would seem to include the following:

1. Discovery of the case—as an existing breakdown, or a need for a new relationship to be developed.
2. Location of case, as to what services, programs, purposes, processes, are to be coordinated.
3. Analysis of weaknesses when the case is one of poor

or brokendown relationships; or of needs, when it is in anticipation of relationships later to be established.

4. Objectives to be supported or attained by the coordination.

5. Determination of personnel involved or to be involved, with alterations in organization and in assignments.

6. The bases with respect to which relationships must be worked out in the case—time, place, activities, etc.

7. The forces or forms of power required to effect the coordination—authority, knowledge, social usage, personal traits, will, taste, friendliness.

8. The relation of the coordinating activity in the case to the planning, the organizing, the directing, and the controlling processes of administration.

9. The need for supplies, equipment, and housing, as means to effect the coordination.

10. Outcomes expected, with possible difficulties or dangers to be met.

Diagnosis thus pursued should reveal the need for coordination and explain the nature of the need. In doing this, one must be able to recognize things that are wrong or lacking and to understand why, in any breakdown, they are producing bad relationships. If one knows what is bad in a case and why it is bad, he must also know much about what would be good, for things are bad in terms of standards of goodness. It does not follow from this, however, that if one can diagnose, he also can prescribe. For this it is not enough to know what is lacking, or even what is needed; one also must know how to administer the cure. Prescription, as the second stage in the process of coordination, must try to anticipate the problems of execution, which would seem to include the following:

1. Have a clear understanding of all that is shown by the diagnosis.

2. Know what relationships are to be effected in a new case or altered in an existing situation.

3. Outline definite ways and means for effecting the development of the change.

4. Give careful consideration to the effects anticipated, making sure that they will facilitate or lead toward the desired relationships.

These four steps or aspects of the task of prescription complete the planning part of coordination. The next and final move, that of putting the results of this work into effect, brings us to coordination as a phase of the directing process. Here, the proposed plan is empowered and the changes are put into effect. Direction orders the changes required, but as the changes are to produce coordination, the director shapes his orders or instructions with careful respect to the effects they may have upon this final outcome. In so far as his actions are motivated by coordination needs, to that extent direction and coordination go on together, the latter being the objective of the former.

The nature of the coordinating process. With this description of the elements and of the forms of activity involved in coordination, certain facts about the nature of the process stand out. As was noted at the outset and as is readily observable, coordination, at the beginning of the process, is essentially intellectual and of the nature of planning; it is planning for relationships. In its final stage, it is similarly related to direction; and at any stage, it may involve the process of organizing or that of control. These relationships have been illustrated above. The point that stands out most clearly is that coordination is rarely, if ever, an entirely separate activity. In most cases, it is almost certain to disturb some feature of the existing organization, to bring new and special tasks to planning and to direction; and often it may make changes or introduce new forms of control.

How the first step, discovery of need for coordination, is taken would be difficult to explain. This is discovery, a creative type of work, for which some are well-equipped by nature, while others are but ill-equipped. However, the

less imaginative one is, the more systematic he should be in using the powers he has. First of all, there can be no substitute for scientific training. A good administrator has a program of reading, travel, and observation, by which he keeps his basic training abreast of his position. Second, an administrator must study his work. Continuous inspection is not only an important phase of his routine, but it affords him his best opportunity for study. It is one thing to inspect merely by observing things as they are, and a quite different thing to view what is, in the light of a clearly thought-out idea of what ought to be and could be. An administrator must organize and constantly reorganize, dealing always with relationships between services, as well as with objects and the interests of persons. So, in all phases of his work, the administrator has opportunity to examine and reexamine the purposes, parts, and processes of his realm. If, instead of being content at not finding defects, he would be on the alert for chances to improve relationships, he might discover more needs for coordination activities than could one who was more imaginative but less systematic, less critical, and less industrious in his work.

One can hardly fail to find coordinating work to do when cases appear at his office as trouble or friction. To be able to anticipate and forestall such cases is a more constructive way. This can be achieved only if one is able to detect the early signs of needs or of troubles, as they first appear. If children arrive at school and there are neither teachers nor rooms for them, then instructional needs and the facilities for instruction are far apart; administration has failed to read the signs in advance. If numbers of high school graduates fail at college, there is surely a poor coordination between the programs involved, and the high school cannot avoid some blame.

By continuous study of all that is involved in one's work it should be possible to see signs of conditions which, if neglected, may lead to breakdown. How to proceed when such signs are seen is clearly suggested by the above plan

for analyzing a case. To illustrate, suppose that the demand for adding junior college work has reached a stage at which it is time to plan for a program. This will involve a working relationship between the high school and junior college curriculums. Of course, there would be many other coordination problems besides this. Relations in matters of finances, administrative setup, general policies affecting government and the conduct of students, scholastic standards, library and playground facilities, and many other matters will have to be so arranged as to be consistent with the existing scheme and regimen of life.

When the problem—coordination between high school and junior college curriculums—has been located, the diagnosis procedure would search out the factors that would reveal the need for this program to be in a working relationship to the high school program. Since the junior college students will be from the high school, the reason for coordination is obvious; but in what ways, on what basis, by whom, in what terms, by what forms of authority, and through what devices? How is all this, when achieved, going to affect the existing purposes, machinery, processes, and output of the system? What added facilities and staff and finance may be involved? These questions have to be answered, partly by facts about the students and their present and future needs, partly by facts about the financial ability of the district, and partly by facts about properties and the physical environment.

In taking the second step—prescription—one would start with the results of the study of needs: first, the instructional needs of both high school and junior college students; second, the need to stay within the financial capacity of the district; third, the need for sound economy in the use of existing plant, staff, and teaching facilities. Together, this provides the basis for formulating objectives and plans, which would be the first step in prescription. The intelligence, the interests, and the character of the students would provide an index to what they may be capable of doing.

This, with the attitudes and interests of parents, would indicate what it might be worth trying to do. Knowledge of the financial, physical, and teaching facilities that exist or that can be provided would reveal the extent to which it would seem wise to try to go toward the ideal program.

Beyond this, it is a question of how to do the work. Coordination must be effected in a manner that will achieve the goals of good education and sound economy throughout. Instruction in the junior college must begin where high school education ends. But high school education may need to change its previous ending, in view of the fact that its students are now to go to college. This is not merely a case of adding courses to the existing high school curriculum; rather, it is one of resetting the high school sights to aim toward the more distant mark. Coordinating must mean reconstruction of the early work, as well as adding the college courses. What is true of studies will be true when arrangements are made for plant, budget, staff, teaching facilities, record and report systems, guidance and research service, work and study programs, graduation requirements, and public-relations service. In all these areas, the mechanism and, in no small way, the entire regimen of life in school will have to be reconstructed. This is sure to affect also many job assignments, many work schedules, and many of the working routines and devices. Inevitably involved, therefore, will be the personal likes and dislikes and the actual working relationships among the employees. It is likely to call for some use of guessing as to what would be best to do, and it may involve some failures and revisions.

When direction takes hold to energize the plan, to administer the coordinations, its aim will be to achieve the objectives by the means and procedures worked out in the prescription. The measure of success to be looked for is not in the immediate coordinations alone, but also in the morale of the staff, the students, and the community. The change should not create uneasiness or a sense of being out of adjustment with the school as an institution. It should not

create fears or discord or a sense of insecurity. Instead, it should be a stimulus, bringing a fresh outlook and a sense of growth and achievement to all concerned. This spirit of comradeship, developed while achieving new goals in the work, is a coordinating force of great power, for it assures that the interest and the will to make things work is behind the intelligence and the authority that plans and directs it.

One cannot regard the coordinating function as an easy feature for the administrative process to achieve. Whether one views it as purpose or as relationships or as process, it is complex. It is complex in the nature of the things it has to unite, in the nature of the forces available for holding the separate elements together, and in the acitivities and devices required to bring these forces to bear.

Chapter 6. CONTROL AS AN ELEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

A distinction is made here between general and technical usages of the term control in administration, the latter usage being the main, though not exclusive, concern of this chapter. Control by facts, norms, laws, or other impersonal means can be studied apart from the direct control of persons.

The first analysis is concerned with the forms of power by means of which control can be effected. Three forms—legal, factual, and social—are noted as available. The nature and possible uses of each of these as controls is examined, and illustrations are given for each, to show how they may effect control over people or materials or time or relationships. Further to clarify the control function, a distinction is made between the uses of these forms of power as controls and their uses in planning, directing, coordinating, and organizing.

The next step is concerned with types of devices and methods through which the control power may be applied to tasks. This shows how in practice we have come to identify power with device. An audit is a method or a device by which accounts and properties are checked, but the thing that makes it control is the legal status it has, together with the facts it reveals. Following this, a number of the more important control mechanisms are examined, not only for what makes them control, but for the kinds of power they use, for the nature of the device itself, and for the ways the device can be made to function.

Finally, thought is given to the practical task of deciding what power and what device would be best to use in a given case. A brief summary of the steps in the reasoning then follows.

1. *The Term Control and Its Use in Administration*

Definition of the term. Although in its use in administration the word control has become a technical term, it has retained much of its common-language meaning. In its common usage, control includes directing, compelling, guiding, and instructing, as well as the basis for evaluating or judging or deciding or acting; whereas, in its technical use, it covers the latter only, the former falling within other parts of the administrative process—mainly, that of directing.

Four elements essential in control. To get at the nature of administrative control, one may think of it in four ways: (1) in terms of the nature of the power that effects it; (2) in terms of the instruments, devices, or techniques through which the power becomes effective or through which it is made available or is brought to bear in management;[1] (3) in terms of the process of applying the power, through the instruments, devices, and techniques of control, to determine whether purposes, plans, policies, orders, assignments, and contracts are being carried out, and how effectively, in a given case; and (4) in terms of the purpose or end sought, which is to guarantee integrity, intelligence, and economy, throughout the enterprise, or at the points in question, in terms of the reason for its existence. The results of such a check or evaluation provide a basis for judging the merits of previous action. Control may be used not only to weed out wrong aims or actions, but also to guide future actions.

Control without power or authority is hardly conceivable;

[1] See the author's "School Board Control—The Necessary Tools and Procedures." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 28:561–580, November, 1942; also his *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938; also his "Analysis of School Administrative Controls." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 20:401–430, September, 1934.

hence, the importance of our knowing the nature and source of this power. Power can do work only if it is brought to bear upon the task through some medium or device by which its energy can be focused; hence, the importance of our study of these instruments, devices, or media. Power, even with media for containing and applying it, is of no effect until it is set to its task, and this can be done only when the nature of the power, the nature of the task, and the behavior of the power when applied to the task are known; hence, the importance of our recognizing the sum of these as a single function and as a complete but very special process in management. Finally, control can be judged effective or ineffective only if it attains some predetermined end or purpose. To be effective is to be effective for something.

Relation of control to other elements in the administrative process. Control, as one of the elements in the total administrative process, is closely related to and, at points, may be almost inseparable from the other elements. But because, in most cases, it is clearly separable from the total and because, in all cases, its separate recognition as a function provides a useful approach to the study of management, it should not be too difficult to avoid the danger of destroying the unity of the total administrative process by too sharp a separation of its related elements or functions.

The connection of control with organization, direction, coordination, and planning is implicit in the common meaning, as well as in the technical usage of these terms. Planning sets up purposes and outlines procedures and means of attaining the purposes; organization divides the labor and holds people to their jobs; direction authorizes and orders actions, plans, and policies and can penalize inaction or abuse; coordination holds parts together, to the end that each supports or supplements the others. All these are, indeed, contributions to control in a broad and general sense.

In a similar way, one could take samples of control, and show how in each case a contribution is made to one or more

of the other four functions, also. For instance, control of finance is effected mainly by the budget, which is an expression of financial planning, and the adhering to which is ordered or *directed* by the chief executive. The scholastic record system provides a means of control over, but also, a means of coordinating, the instructional programs of children and of groups. Planning a curriculum is arranging for certain controls over instruction.

Control can be effective only by the applying of some form of authority. In school administration it seems useful to think of the function of control as the activity of some kind of power, which, regardless of its source or position or nature, tends to hold or to provide the basis for holding to account officers and employees and all materials and processes and programs, in terms of their contracts, assignments, and purposes, as such. But little examination of administrative practice is needed to show that the law operates as power, or authority, to effect control. We speak of judicial control, or control through our courts; of legislative control, by enacting laws; and of administrative control, or control by executing or directing the execution of the laws. When, in case of the latter, the law allows wide discretion as to how it is to be applied to cases, we speak of that exercise of discretion as control by man. This is control in its general, not its technical, meaning. Yet, by its existence alone, law may also provide a basis for checking or evaluating all that is done. This is control in a technical sense.[2]

It is equally clear that power of control exists in the form of facts or principles. The bare facts of a budget or of a cost study may operate as control of expenditures and provide a basis for judging the results of spending. This is control in a technical sense. The theories of learning and of teaching may, in a similar way, control action as to how to organize children and school plant and teachers for instruction.

[2] John Dickinson, "Judicial Control of Official Discretion." *The American Political Science Review*, 22:275–300, May, 1928.

The principles or norms of professional ethics control, often with as firm a hand as that of law; and related to professional ethics is the entire system of social proprieties, conventions, customs, manners, beliefs, and traditions of the people. As norms for judging merit, these forces effect control in a technical sense. We depend much upon these social forces. In a sense, the law itself cannot defy them, and scientific discovery makes only plodding advance against them. Professional ethics is but a specialized formulation of these social forces.

The behavior of these forces in effecting control in a general sense is everywhere apparent in management.[3] Manipulating them into positions so that they will provide bases for evaluating service is one of the major tasks in building any scheme of government whatever. Certainty that they will operate as bases for evaluation guarantees that they will function, also, in motivating action everywhere, regardless of whether it be in organizing, directing, planning, or coordinating; and regardless of whether it be in the realm of administration at all, or that of teaching, or research, or keeping records, or cleaning buildings.

Power for control is best applied through special devices. In order to bring any one of these forms of power to bear in management, it is necessary to have instruments suitable for handling it. To effect control over funds, we devise a budget and enact it as a law. To control scholarship, we enact curriculums, marking systems, and graduation standards. Besides the force of law, the budget also embodies the power of knowledge, since all its sections refer to divisions of a planned program of instruction. This program, in turn, was designed in terms of the laws of learning and teaching as they apply to the facts about the children and the community in question.

Controls are needed in all areas of school work. In practical management it is seldom enough to have a law author-

[3] Dorothy Fosdick, "Ethical Standards and Political Strategies." *Political Science Quarterly*, 57:214–228, June, 1942.

izing action on a matter. Besides the law, there must be a specific plan of action by which the legal power is brought to and applied to the work. General laws governing use of school funds would be impossible to apply without the use of a budget, an accounting system, an audit, and a public report. A sound knowledge of education would be useless in school work if it could not be applied through such devices as curriculums, courses, units of study, standards of achievement and graduation, guidance records, scholastic record systems, health reports, and the like.

The more specific and technical the task becomes in school work, the more care it is necessary to give to the task of bringing the power of law, knowledge, and social standards to bear in management. Also, the more general the law and knowledge and social norms, the more necessary it is to provide devices by which these general powers can be focused upon specific tasks. This suggests that devices for control are very specific instruments and that they must be designed with respect both to the nature of the work they are to do and the kind of power they are to convey to the work.

Control as a process. Thought of as a process, control is merely the act of determining where control is needed; of choosing what form or forms of power to use; of preparing suitable devices for bringing the needed power to the work; and of supervising, inspecting, and evaluating results. Part of control, as a process, is planning; part of it may be organizing or coordinating; and part of it must involve direction. Apart from these other forms of administrative activity, the process of control is almost automatic. It is the nature of law to control, if only the planner arranges for it and the director sets it to its task. It is power that carries on, that holds things in place or to account. It is the function of knowledge to ascertain what matters should be controlled and how the control should be effected.

Control and its objectives. The fourth element by which

a study of control may be approached is that of its goals. Power (law, knowledge, social usage), devices (specialized administrative instruments), and process must be guided to some end. The function of the end (the control that is needed) must have much to do with the kind of power one might use; the nature of the power, together with the nature of the task, must determine what kind of device is best to use; the process, in turn, can go forward only in terms of the power, the device, and the nature of the work. Thus, control must be studied as a single, unified element in administration, the object of breaking it down being useful only as a means of revealing its nature and how it plays its special part in management as a whole.

Since any study of control as power and any study of control devices must deal constantly with the process and the objectives of control, our procedure will be to examine the several forms of power and, at some length, the behavior of the power, as it is applied to school problems through devices, reserving less space for consideration of control as process and of its objectives.

2. *The Nature of Control as Effected through Legal Authority*

The nature of school law. Law is the basis of the right and of the duty to act in public school work. Also, it is a prescription of what the rights and duties cover and, in some cases, of how and when the duties are to be performed. Whoever is employed in the schools has some rights and duties and, so, must use and be controlled by some of this authority. This authority may be broad and general as it provides rights and duties for one officer, or very narrow and specific as it applies to another. It may empower one to perform any administrative service needed and to act in any part of the school system at any time; while for another it may limit action to the planning, or largely to organizing and directing, or mainly to coordinating or controlling, and this within a limited part of the system only. The law is

impersonal; its power is assigned to officers or functionaries, not to persons.

Law, for the schools, may be constitutional or statutory, or it may be in the form of state regulations. For all such law, a local board can determine who shall have the rights and duties covered by the law, but it cannot alter the law itself. When the law is general, the board can particularize it through its own rules and regulations or special decisions, as long as it holds to the intent of the law itself. This applies, whether the main object of the law is control or administration as a whole or any other school function.

Law may express authority in the form of a command, or as an authorization, or as directions or specifications for doing something, or as limitations to action, or as prevention to action. The authority of law may pertain to the purposes to be served by the unit of government in question, or to the organization of the program of service, or to the personnel or revenues or housing or materials or equipment, or to procedures to be followed. In all these forms and for all these ends alike, the school law creates authority, with a view to its use in getting work done, or as a means of preventing interference with the law's intent or processes. In form, the law may declare either "thou shalt" or "thou shalt not."

Law as an energizer of action. There are two ways of viewing the law as it operates in administration. First, it may empower and cause one to act or forbid him to act; and second, it may operate as a standard or norm against which performance or nonperformance must stand in judgment. When law is operating to produce action or to forbid action it seems alive, positive, and aggressive. It seems to be coursing through the veins of the institution, providing purpose, energy, and direction to all its parts. This law is operating as planning, directing, organizing, and coordinating.

Law as control. When the law operates as a standard or norm, *e.g.*, as a basis for judging rightness in action, it seems

less colorful[4] because it does not appear to be doing any work. It seems impersonal, even stolid and indifferent, except to those who have violated it or who may be searching for ways around it. To any such it must seem forbidding and even seeking opportunity to spring upon them. To any but such exceptions, however, it operates as a norm by which to judge their own success and the progress of the total enterprise. This is law operating as control in administration.

It should be noted that the element of control in law lies both in the power it represents, together with the certainty that the power will be applied if it is not respected, and in the attitude of general acceptance of the law by the people, as the social standard of the time. So, in a sense, legal control is as much by force of social standards as by force of the law itself. In administration, a law may be potentially powerful but be weak and ineffective in practice because it is not appealed to, either by those who command or by those who are commanded by it. Distinction must be made, therefore, between the power of control and the effective application of the power to the work needing control.

3. *The Nature of Control as Effected through Facts and Principles*[5]

Knowledge holds a high place in our behavior. Knowledge, in the form of facts, principles, propositions, formulae, or hypotheses, is so much and so continuously a part of ourselves and of our daily lives, that often we are little aware of how our knowing determines our actions. We seldom

[4] If one views the norms set up by a law as a danger sign or as a threat to be feared, instead of as a friendly guide to action, he is not likely to make wise administrative use of the law.

[5] See Mary Parker Follett, "The Process of Control," and Luther H. Gulick, "Science Values in Public Administration." In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

act or restrain our impulses to act, except with respect to facts of some sort. We make our laws in the light of the facts of our experience, as much as we do in the light of our ideals and our system of values. Even our values and ideals are molded to fit somewhat into the facts of the world we are in; furthermore, we have used our knowledge of life in developing our ideals and in living by them.

By administration we mean studied action. In management, the hard facts of life confront one so forcefully that he soon finds that he is in no dream world; that what he does affects others; and that, to be effective, decisions and orders must be rational. Compelling people against the dictates of reason is too inconsistent to be long tolerated in our form of culture. Besides having a clear and defensible purpose, administration must proceed by sound logic. Purpose and logic can be defensible and sound only if they are in respect to the facts and principles of education and sound reasoning as they apply in the circumstances of the case in hand.

That knowledge is as much the basis for control as it is for planning or organizing or directing or coordinating in administration may readily be seen. If one chooses not to act in a given case, it must be that he has made that decision in light of his knowledge of the case; otherwise, why did he refrain? Mere apathy or indifference or dullness cannot stand for long as the basis for either action or inaction in management.

Knowledge, with law, as control in a technical sense. Besides this control in a general sense, knowledge is the basis of control in its technical sense.[6] In general, one looks at

[6] The idea of control implied in the term comptroller—as it is commonly used in business management—is useful in school administration because education can use not only its strictly technical processes with good effect, but also its concept of control in relation to the broader purposes, the social responsibilities of business. See J. Hugh Jackson, *The Comptroller.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948, p. 17 *ff.*

the results of what he has done as a guide to further action. When this is done with precision, we think of it as control in a technical sense. The use of tests and examinations in teaching or the use of a study of costs in budget making illustrates this, for here the findings from a study of facts are a measuring stick and a standard to guide next steps.

In many cases, facts can be used in a form that seems to make a perfect control.[7] A set of rules may be enacted, providing that classes in algebra shall not exceed twenty-five in number; that supplies for instruction shall be provided on the basis of X dollars per pupil; that classrooms shall be provided with seats on the basis of X square feet of floor space per occupant; that depreciation on wooden buildings shall be computed at the rate of X per cent per year; that salaries shall be determined—here will follow a statement of policy (which is law) and a group of schedules, providing for beginners, for newly employed but experienced, and for those previously or long employed; and providing for increments in salary based upon experience, training, tenure, and success. Most of the salary specifications can be expressed in quantitative terms.

Such rules provide control primarily through facts. However, attention is called to the point that, in all these cases of fact control—and these are but a few samples—the control is in the facts, in one sense, but in the law or rule or policy behind the facts, in another. Facts in such cases are lifeless and ineffective until they are activated by the authority of law. It is the law that makes them operative. These are cases in which facts can control, only because they are made into some kind of instruments or devices that bring the current of legal power to them when they are needed to shape and to guide or to stop some action, or to change any hesitancy to act. In the above cases, the facts seem to turn on the law as one turns on electric lights.

[7] See: E. O. Stene, "An Approach to a Science of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1124–1137, December, 1940.

When the registrations reach twenty-five, that turns on the rule or policy or standard governing class size. But, as it is the electricity that lights the lamp, so it is the rule, the authority of law, that stops further registrations in the class.

Knowledge as the sole basis of control. There are other cases in which facts are used as controls in administration without having any law back of them, in the sense just illustrated. Several cases of this type suggest themselves. In the preparing of a budget, studies of prospective enrollments and attendance are made as bases for estimating the need for supplies and additions to staff. In the developing of a building program, the useful life of each building, determined by studies of depreciation and obsolescence, has to be known and used as a control over demand for replacement of outworn plants. Studies of heating cost in different types of buildings, or in like buildings with different types of heating systems, may be used to control choice of the type of building to erect or of heating system to install. These are cases in which the facts are backed more by the obligation and desire to apply principles of economy and sound principles of instruction and housing than they are by law. They are backed by law, however, in the sense that the law contemplates and supports and authorizes sound economy and sound educational procedures; and if the administrator uses such studies, he uses them with authority, even though their use may not be provided for specifically, as in a law, rule, policy, or other special device of school government.

In using facts as controls, as is true of law, one has to be discriminating; for, to be effective as controls, facts must be pertinent to the case in question. By a cost analysis one may find that algebra instruction is costing $25 per student in one high school and $28 in another. Does this call for spending more freely in one or less freely in the other? Certainly neither, without study of still more facts. This difference may be an unavoidable difference, for it may be the best that can be had when the instruction programs are

properly fitted to educational needs in the two schools. So, control by facts is no simpler than is control by law, and often it is far more difficult to apply.

4. *The Nature of Control as Effected through Personal and Professional Ethics and Social Proprieties*[8]

Impersonal vs. personal forms of control. Controls that are effected by force of law or by force of fact or principle are relatively impersonal or objective. When the law authorizes a certain procedure for establishing a school, or when it is applied through a contract, it remains constant for all parties. When decision or action is based upon facts, no amount of wishing or prejudice can alter it. It is true that over a long period law tends to grow with the times and, in many cases, that facts, even though they do not change in themselves, are differently evaluated in different periods. Such changes, however, are discernible only for very long periods or as between widely different cultures.

Man's desire for certainty in his affairs, and for consistency and security, as well as for economy of effort and for the pleasure of living on understanding terms with others, causes him to develop and apply impersonal controls wherever he can. We have learned to trust figures, even though we may dislike the things they reveal about our doings. A law, a fact, a principle may not attack us, but neither can we set it aside, for it stands as truth. We can use or ignore it as we choose, but it is certain to count in the end. Since facts are constant in their bearing in any case, they are readily usable as a basis of understanding; and since facts do not lie, we can afford to be guided by them. The more knowledge we develop about education, therefore, the more possibilities we shall have for using the power of fact to guide our procedures.

However objective our world may be, and however far

[8] Roland L. Warren, "The Place of Values in Social Theory." *Journal of Social Philosophy and Jurisprudence,* 7:223–239, April, 1942.

we may go in building a science of education, we ourselves, as individuals and as societies, are also to be considered. As individuals, we are in part self-impelled. We move somewhat in terms of knowledge but, in part, also by habit and in terms of our ideals, beliefs, prejudices, tastes, and feelings. Corresponding to these, society has its traditions, customs, proprieties and conventions, and its systems of ethics. These are powerful forces that impel us from within and compel us from without. Our habits and beliefs are acquired slowly as we grow up, and with these we acquire attitudes and feelings of respect for the prevailing traditions and customs and ethical concepts of our people. These forms of behavior and these ways of life form a culture pattern so widely accepted and used that the standardized habits and customs are accepted as bases against which we predict and judge the conduct of each other.

How personal and social forces may operate as controls. Since one's personal habits and beliefs are built up in terms of what we strive for, and since what we strive for is governed not only by our bodily needs and our personal tastes, but also by what may be available to us in our environment to choose from, and since our environment is social as well as physical, our personalities and our characters should grow up in close adjustment with the traditions, customs, and conventions of society. If such harmony were actually attained, the individual would always conform to the established social standards from choice. It frequently happens otherwise—that the personality, with its way of life, is not consistent with the social standards fixed by tradition or by our ethical concepts and norms, so that the urge that comes from within is in conflict with the force that is exerted by social demand or social approval.

As controls over conduct, these two forces must be thought of separately, as well as together. In management, we must know that we can use law and knowledge as controls, but that these are applied to work by persons—persons who are moved to act, in part, by their own inner impulses,

tastes, and wants; in part, by the pressure of the social standards of the time upon them. When the personal standards of an employee are found to be consistent with accepted social standards, we trust him; when we have reason to think the opposite, we do not trust him so far. The individual may conform to social standards by choice or only from fear of conflict with them. To be labeled as ill-mannered or as unprofessional is to have many of the possibilities of life cut off. Thus, fear of social banishment tends to deter one from unprofessional conduct or even to drive him to aggressive conformance with the standards of professional behavior.

An individual may conform to social standards, not because he believes in and desires to live by them, but in order to have the reward of social approval. Management must judge in each case, therefore, whether conformance is real or whether it is hypocrisy, impelled by fear.

About these less objective forms of power, management can never be quite so certain as it can be about the powers of the law and of knowledge. Use of these personal and social powers as controls undoubtedly has great possibilities, provided that we can find ways to apply them with reasonable sureness. Since they are not separable from persons, they can be only as constant, as consistent, and as powerful as are the persons who apply them. We know that they will be effective for control as long as personal wish and habit run parallel with social standards. It is when they might be at odds with each other that, as controls, we could not trust them. Of one thing we are sure. These two forms of power are real, they exist in all social enterprises, they motivate and control human conduct everywhere. Accordingly, they are elements in management and we must deal with them.

Management's responsibility for using these forms of power. It should not be necessary to bind employees to rules or orders to do things that they would normally choose to do. When we employ a teacher, we entrust children to

his care and feel sure enough that the children will be treated both humanely and intelligently. The teacher's certificate to teach is an index of personality, character, and training, which can be as firmly relied upon to control the teacher's behavior as if they were a law or a measurable fact or unit of power. Yet, there is a limit to human effort, to zeal, to the will to sacrifice self-interest, and to the desire to merit social approval. As care of children brings fatigue, the controlling power of personal standards and of social approval tend to hold less firmly. Further, individuals vary widely as to how these forces affect their conduct.

If management is to deal intelligently with these factors, it will try to understand them; it will make as large a place as possible for human freedom in management; but it will not do this by trusting entirely to chance or to offhand guessing. It will regard these forms of power as something to use constructively and not as something to ignore or to try to suppress. The task of finding ways for using them, of developing devices for applying them in school work, is as much a responsibility of management as is the parallel task of preparing devices for applying the power of law and of knowledge.

5. *Instruments, Devices, and Methods of Control*

Power, and devices for applying it to its objective. One may have power for control but lack suitable ways and means for bringing that power to bear when and where the control is needed. The law, knowledge (facts, principles, and the methods of science and of logic), professional ethics, and personal beliefs, and social customs and proprieties provide administrators with power. This power is not theirs to use entirely at will, but they can use the various forms of it within the limits of its own nature.

To complete an examination into the nature of control through use of these forms of power, it is necessary to consider them at work or to consider how to apply them; *e.g.*,

how they can be made to effect control at the time and place and in the manner desired. Control is needed throughout the school enterprise—over its purposes, employees, children, instructional program, finance, plant, equipment, public relations. Wherever there is any look ahead, any form of action or decision, any contract or ownership or debt or property, there must be some appropriate form of control, either to guide the action or to evaluate the results of it.

Since materials are inactive in themselves and can be held and used by persons, it might be well enough to think of control as applying to persons only. In many cases, usage is otherwise, however, and for the reason that the material or the object—finance, credit, supplies, plant, library—is usable or consumable by many persons; also, it is easier to keep a check on the property than on all the people; often too, it is the property value that we wish to conserve. In such cases, however, control may be effected by applying power either to the object or to those who use the object or, it may be, to both. So, we may devise a plan for the control of money (as to its uses), or for the control of the people who are to use the money. In either case, we have three factors to consider: (1) the power that effects the control; (2) the device by which the power of control is brought to bear; and (3) the object (persons, materials, or processes) upon which the control is focused.

The budget and curriculum as devices for control.[9] At this point, attention is invited to the device which is used as a receptacle of the power or as the channel through which the power is made effective, as it is applied to its object.

We may think of the budget as an administrative instru-

[9] For a study of the place of policy and the function of a board of directors in this area of management, see Melvin T. Copeland and Andrew R. Towl, *The Board of Directors and Business Management.* Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1947. Chap. V.

ment or device for control if we view it as a complete document, ready for use. If we think of the service it provides in the way of channeling funds to the needed services and materials, we may think of the budget as a method of collecting funds from their sources and distributing funds to points where they are needed. As an administrative process, this is as much direction as it is control. As a control on funds, the budget limits people in their uses of them. This kind of control is effected by the legal authority, together with the figures and specifications that make up the budget. State law requires school budgeting, the board enacts or adopts the budget, and the superintendent is authorized to direct its execution. The budget is in fact a law and, as such, it is an instrument for the residence and flow of legal authority. This authority directs the assembling and spending of funds to specified ends. The directing is not mere guidance; it is also control, because the specifications have to be followed and by them the management is sure to be judged.

The budget represents another form of control when we consider it as a financial expression of an educational program. Here, the authority of the wisdom and sound judgment which it embodies gives it power. It is a symbol of intelligence, a plan of action, that represents study and careful balancing of educational values and, so, commands the respect of all. This high social and professional status means, too, that it is supported by public opinion. This is a case of where the authority of knowledge both directs and controls, and where it is supported also by the power of social approval.

This "power of knowledge" affects control more directly in still another way. Since every service and every item of material used in the schools represents money, a study of the uses of money can provide a useful approach for the study of the educational services and materials purchased. In this way the budget figures provide a quantitative terminology through which one may get a helpful basis for com-

paring intangible educational values. Is it better to put $10,000 into additional courses in a high school; or should it go into shops, laboratories, and studios, for upper grade children? Here, asking how many children will be affected in each case, we find the estimated cost to be $50 per pupil in one case and $24 in the other. By pursuing such analysis, school administrators are able to develop many new ways of seeing and comparing the services and materials they are planning for. This is control in the form of checking, evaluating, analyzing, judging.

Control important as a whole, not as power alone or as device alone. From this illustration, it is seen that a device or an instrument of control may be used to effect control in three ways: (1) by force of the legal power it represents; (2) by force of social pressure, the public's high regard for the wisdom it embodies and the usefulness it represents to their schools; and (3) by applying the power of facts as a medium or means whereby the value of the devices may be examined and judged. It is not to be expected that all devices for control will be or need be designed to utilize all three of these forms of power as their means. The point is that the device without power is a meaningless and inert and useless mechanism, but with it, the device comes alive and exerts a quiet—but compelling—legal, social, or factual force, as the case may be.

Because power can control only if contained and channeled, and because a device (such as a budget, a salary schedule, a depreciation formula, or a scholastic record system) is effective only when it is empowered, there can be no point in studying mechanical devices or even organization, as mere forms. Instead, their nature as administrative instruments must be judged by their power and mechanical parts and arrangement, all as one. And to know the value of any device, one would have to consider its purpose and its behavior when active. From such study only may one expect to ascertain the nature of control or of any particular type or scheme of control.

6. *The Rule Book a Major Instrument of Control*

Control as one function of the book of rules. For the administration of a school system a wide variety of control devices will be necessary.[10] Some of these will utilize legal power only, others will employ knowledge, while still others will bring to bear social standards or personal motives. More often a device will provide for the use of more than one of these forms of power. The ultimate source of the social and legal power used lies with the people to create or else is inherent in their culture system. Constitution, statutes, regulations, legal precedents, along with our professional and social standards, are types of devices through which these controlling forces are brought to bear upon the persons and the materials employed in the service. If these devices for control do not operate automatically, it becomes the duty of administration to employ direction to enforce them as commands. One may direct an applicant to file his certificate, for instance, but it is the legal significance of the certificate that provides the desired control.

Within any local school system, controls are effected through many local devices—rules, contracts, schedules, calendars, records, forms, and authorizations—all of which must keep within the limits of state controls. The power to establish such local controls rests in the board of education. Some of these it may formulate itself; others, it will adopt as formulated and recommended by its staff of experts. To adopt or authorize, here, means to endow with legal power.

The basic over-all instrument for control, as well as for all other managerial activities in a local system, is the board's

[10] For a good explanation of how to develop a rule book, see W. W. Carpenter and A. G. Capps, "Democratic Procedures in Developing A Code of Rules and Regulations." *The American School Board Journal,* 102:25–26, April, 1941. For consideration of the nature of a rule book, see the author's "Rules and Regulations—Their Nature and Place in a System of School Administration." *The American School Board Journal,* 100:21–22, March, 1943; 22–24, April, 1943; 35–36, May, 1943.

book of rules and regulations. In such a code are to be found the major purposes of education to be pursued, the structure of the school government, definition or outline of the program of instruction, the broader policies, the plan of housing, and the more important procedures for the system. Though some of these rules are intended to function primarily as controls, most of them are designed to provide for directing or coordinating or planning or organizing or, possibly, for a combination of these forms of administrative activity.

Control through rules defining educational purposes. Under the general authority of such a major instrument of control, provision is made for numerous special devices. Before consideration of these, however, a brief examination of the rule book as a control device may be of value. Throughout the rule book, purposes to be served are set up at many points, sometimes stated as such and, again, implied in a statement of policy or in a definition of terms or of duties. Once the board has thus set up a purpose, it follows that all contracts for services and materials are drawn with a view to attaining that purpose. In this manner the official purposes stand as controls over employees at work, over programs and procedures, and over materials to be purchased or used. As such, the power behind the rules may never have to be invoked as an order or as a means of stopping action, because employees understand, approve, and themselves desire to attain these purposes as their educational objectives. The rules thus have much the same effect as a guidepost in preventing travel in a wrong direction and in forming a basis for judging how far one has gone or what part of the journey has been covered.

Rules on organization as controls. Rules covering personnel organization are also devices of control. Organization is the basis of job assignments; as such, it has the effect of channeling effort with a view to its unity and economy. The lines that separate functions or jobs are the controls against false assumption of rights or responsibilities for

work. One's contract and his assignment to duty are other devices of control that provide further extensions of the organization mechanism.

The organization of plant, of the instructional program, of finance, and of the record systems are controls applied to materials and subject matter, rather than to persons direct; yet, they control persons quite as effectively as if they were stated as the powers and duties or as preventions of the action of employees. Such rules operate, also, as bases for judging the integrity and efficiency of management, and they control the energies and actions of those who have to work by them.

Rules defining duties and procedures operate similarly, but as direct controls over persons and, through persons, over the materials they use in their work.

Stated policies as controls. In the form of policies, the rule book will provide for the preparation and use of many special devices and methods. The rule book will provide a policy by which the state school budget law shall be made effective. This policy will make clear how the budget is to be prepared, adopted, and administered, and what revenues and expenditures it shall cover. This policy is a control against all ways of handling money and property, except for those which are consistent with the state laws and with the board's policy. When the budget is completed and adopted, then, through it, this policy is particularized in terms of specific sums for specific services and materials.

The accounting system as a control. To make budget control effective requires more than legal authority. By the fact of its adoption, the budget almost certainly carries with it the backing of social approval, which has much to do with how the funds will be administered. The budget controls by authorizing what can be done in finance. This does not completely assure that the budget will be perfectly carried out. To assure sound execution, a further control is provided in the form of an accounting system and, beyond

this, still a fourth control in the form of an audit is commonly provided for.

One may think of an accounting system as a single instrument of control or as an organized collection of separate devices, each separate account serving an end of its own and, at the same time, contributing to a systematized and unified scheme for preserving all essential facts that cover the history, together with an audit, of every business transaction individually and by classes. For instance, the general ledger of an accounting system is usually thought of as the control of all other accounts and records in the system.

An accounting system controls with respect to two important ends: (1) it guarantees integrity in the conduct of school business; (2) it provides facts and analyses by which both the educational and the economic significance of all transactions may be worked out as needed. The first indicates whether the budget was followed; the second provides a means of evaluating the budget on both an economical and an educational basis.

Business forms as controls. The principle of control is the dominant idea in each business form adopted for use. Teachers' contracts, contracts for buildings, building blueprints with specifications, inventory forms, requisition forms, purchase-order forms, warrants, deeds, insurance policies, wage and salary schedules, payroll, retirement and pension plans, organization charts, plot maps, receipt forms—all these are samples of special devices that help to make up the total mechanism for the control of school business. That many of these function in other phases of the administrative process is obvious; but the idea of control that is rooted in the statute providing for school budgeting, that is extended through a board policy, through an officially formed and adopted budget, and on through all the complex mechanism of an accounting system suggests the major function of these many instruments. Finally, to complete this mechanism of control, yet another stage, including many techni-

cal devices, is required in the form of filing systems, cross-reference indexes, catalogues, and safety vaults. One must be able to find his tools if he is to use them, and they must be safely kept, in case they have real value or are capable of misuse or abuse.

Whether one views these devices as control in a general sense or in a technical sense will depend upon the particular use he desires to make of them. Clearly, they can be effective in directing action; but they serve, also, to hold things to their purposes and, so, to prevent wrong action in administration; furthermore, they can be used as bases for evaluating or judging the wisdom of an action or a decision or the value of a property, a procedure, or a policy; and so, they can be used as a means for guiding future decisions. The rule book may not mention all of these detailed devices, as such; yet their places as extensions of the rule book are clearly implied by the fact that the functions for which they are designed are there to perform.

7. *Salary Schedule as a Control*

The salary schedule provides legal control. The value of a salary schedule as a means of control will bear closer examination than is provided in the above references to it. The ways by which it effects control may throw further light upon the nature of such a schedule, as well as upon the function of control.

As a control, a salary schedule is a legal instrument. By force of its legal status, it provides the basis upon which salaries are determined. When a teacher is to be employed, certain facts pertaining to the teacher are matched against the schedule; and automatically, by that check, the salary is fixed. This is control by law—control, in the sense that the schedule determines how much money is to be paid and prevents the superintendent from altering that figure. That is, it controls the decision of the executive and it controls the salary.

Other forms of power also play a part in the control.

There is more to a salary schedule than this, however. A good schedule bases salary upon training, experience, tenure in the system, and efficiency in service; and it indicates what amounts and combinations of these items are to stand for specified amounts of salary. It is possible and practicable so to arrange these figures that, unless a teacher keeps abreast of his profession, he may acquire negative as well as positive increments to his salary as time passes. This provides a form of control over the teacher's effort to keep abreast of the profession. Neglect may mean penalty; strong effort may mean a prize. In the schools both penalty and prize are stated in terms of money; but they carry with them something almost as valuable, even if less tangible, in the form of social and professional recognition. These latter provide quite as genuine pressures as do financial rewards or penalties, and they tend almost as strongly to hold the teacher to standards.

This social and professional recognition represents a type of pressure from without, partly because these forms of approval are one index of value in an employee. Superintendents are looking for men who stand high in the profession. High standing may be striven for by a teacher, however, either because of personal ambition to achieve the highest possible self-development, or because of the reward it is pretty sure to bring—in money or in improved social and professional standing in the community, or both. So, as control, the schedule's provision for promotion may bring four kinds of power into action: (1) legal power, because this is, in fact, the basis of contracts; (2) knowledge, because certain facts and principles determine the salary and what the executive must do; (3) social approval, because chance of reward or fear of penalty in social and professional status induces effort at professional improvement; and (4) personal, because it affords stimulus and opportunity for self-development and the desire to serve.

A sound salary schedule effects general control over public attitude toward schools. Control is seen, also, in the gen-

eral feeling of confidence that with a schedule there can be no favoritism in the system. The schedule is supposed to be equitable and fair, in the sense that it represents sound public economy. A state or a nation is defeating its own ends when it underpays or overpays those who serve it.[11] This ideal policy may often be ahead of practice but in the minds of the people it has reality, and the existence of a salary schedule is taken as a sign that that policy is in effect. The result is public confidence, in which teachers, executives, board, and the people are all joined. By providing a sound basis for social solidarity on the question of compensation, this provides control against suspicion and fear of partiality or unfairness.

Ways for effecting more specific controls through salaries. Another way by which a salary schedule may provide control is by designing it to fit special situations. Suppose that a system is suffering a heavy turnover in staff and that many of its best teachers are leaving. With the purpose of controlling this loss, a study is made, which reveals that teachers are going elsewhere to better salaries. Question: What is wrong? Is the total salary item of the budget too small, or is the total unwisely distributed or, possibly, are these both responsible? Is the loss from among teachers recently employed, or from among those who have attained the maximum in salary? If it is from the former group, control might be effected by raising salaries of the early years of employment; if from the latter, by raising the maximum salaries. If plenty of good talent is seeking entrance to the system at present salaries, then, possibly some of the money applied on initial salaries could be shifted to better increases for the later years. Thus, by shifting the attention of good pay to the point at which control of loss is needed, the loss can be diminished, assuming that loss is due to low salary.

[11] Proper salary and wage scales in a government where so large a number of people are employed, as in our country, can scarcely fail to support and to stimulate soundness throughout the country's entire economy, partly by direct effect and partly by establishing a sound and influential precedent.

Often it is due to low morale, caused by other factors as well, such as hard work program, poor management, inadequate facilities, and no sick-leave allowance.

8. *The Building Program as a Control*

A building program controls through the power of science, philosophy, and social approval. A building program is a plan for directing, as well as for controlling, plant operation and plant expansion. To do either, the program must cover proposed action through a period of years, and it must be under continuous study and revision, to make sure that it is in reality abreast. Such a program is developed in terms of known and estimated needs, as these are affected by changes in numbers to be housed; by changes in instructional program that may require expression in the form or amount of housing; by the effects of obsolescence, wear and tear, and loss by fire or other damage; by shifts in price and wage structures; and by demands for other public needs that may affect tax rates.

The control that is desired is largely, but not solely, factual, in the sense that everything must add up. To be sound, a building program must have positive social approval back of it; besides, it should hold to good form in architecture, which may not be so much a matter of fact as of taste or, perhaps, a compromise of many differences in taste. Further, a good building program, being designed to fit buildings to desired educational activities, will often have to choose what educational values to work toward. Here it is not facts alone, but also choice of cultural values, that give shape to the plan. In the realm of materials, prices, wages, space needed, engineering matters, and the like, facts are of major importance. Even here there often may be questions of judgment and public preference as to how large a sum to spend; whether to bond or not to bond; how plain or ornate, strictly utilitarian or monumental the type of architecture shall be; where to build and where not to build. These are not questions of fact alone. The people

should participate in effecting these decisions, and the leadership of school officials should make this participation possible by keeping the public properly abreast of its planning.[12]

What the building plan controls. Control in the plan resides in the force it exercises to hold developments as close and true to educational needs as the financial capacity of the district warrants. It is seen in the power of the program to prevent waste and in its power to keep the interest and pride of the people centered in their schools. In so far as the school plant expresses social approval and good taste, it stands, also, as a general force for social control, by providing standards or measuring sticks against which private, as well as public, buildings come to be judged.

Aside from this general control, the building program stands guard over many details of management. For instance, by the program, plant is to be abandoned two years later. This fact effects a useful control over maintenance expense for that plant. Few repairs will be made, except for safety and health. As population shows prospect of increase in new areas, the plan will indicate purchase of new sites before costs become too much affected by the growing demand. The plan will call for redistricting for attendance areas as population shifts, thus refilling buildings that are being vacated and relieving crowded buildings.

9. *The Program of Instruction as a Control*

Control as one element in administering instruction. Another major and comprehensive instrument of control is that of the program of instruction. This program can be thought of as a unified *plan* of education, an *organization* of

[12] This does not mean that every trivial matter is to be made a question of public debate. The board must know the public it is speaking for, and it must exercise leadership where leadership is needed. It should rarely, if ever, act on any matter of importance in defiance of public opinion. The noisy clamor of a propagandizing minority group is not to be confused with public opinion.

instructional materials and activities, for the district as a whole. It is the function of administration to see this program as a unified scheme; and if it is to be effective, it must operate in organized form and not cause the system to break up into little, independent units, which so often show a proneness for competition, with a consequent training in prejudices inconsistent with the meaning of liberal education.

By virtue of its being a plan of study and, so, a plan of teaching, it *controls* students and teachers very directly in practically all that they do. Further, such a program not only organizes materials for teachers and students, it also *directs* and *coordinates* their activities; but here concern is with its power as a control.

Besides controlling teachers and students, it is a control over principals, directors, supervisors, research workers, guidance workers, nurses, doctors, attendance officers, curriculum workers, and others who have any part in either making or revising it or in administering the instruction. Whatever work any one does touching the development or management of the instructional program, that work must check with the official program and must be judged by the contribution it makes to that program. In this way, the program effects control.

Control effected more by knowledge than by law. The power of control in this instrument is to be found, first of all, in the legal force back of the program. The program is, in reality, a law. It is authorized by statutes, it is officially enacted by the board, and it is administered much as is any other law.

The extent to which this legal power of control is made apparent through direction in management will vary greatly. There are places where the element of authority is an ever-present and obvious label on all actions and decisions—whatever is done in the name of the law or the board's policy or the superintendent's order. In such school systems, by implications, at least, the reason for doing anything seems

to be that the law or the board or the superintendent or the principal has so ordered. In such schools, many things that should be cared for mainly through controls are achieved by direction, instead.

This legal element needs only a little scrutiny to show that any such use of it as this is no less than an abuse. Here, especially, legal power is a means, not an end. It is a means in the fact that the program was not established as law until first it had been born of a careful study of the community's needs for education. Such a state school law is very general, so general that to apply it in any locality a study of local educational needs is first required. The statutes imply that these studies will be made as a basis for any local program. A board acts only upon the results of such studies when it adopts a curriculum or any policy to govern its curriculum. Thus, in origin, the instructional program is a product of study; and it is this study, not the law alone, that makes it good. To administer it in terms of any authority, without recognizing also the authority of the knowledge that went into its making, is to miss the whole idea of sound government. The purpose of the law is merely to put legal approval and power behind the power of knowledge, and not at all to dismiss or diminish the effects that the knowledge may have in the control of instruction.

Social standards also play a part in the control. Besides law and knowledge, there is a third element of control in a curriculum; it is the power of social approval. At the end of his course, the student receives a highly prized social recognition. The parent shares in this prize, and the school and the community share in it. Though not exactly measurable, the social value of a school diploma is everywhere recognized. As a force, this social worth of an education drives parents to sacrifice in order that their children may be in school; and it drives students to serious effort at difficult tasks when they would like to play. By maintaining high standards and excellent teaching service, teachers gain

local and professional recognition, so it causes them to work hard. In so far as it stands as a basis for judging educational achievement, in so far as it holds people true to a purpose or plan of action or restrains tendencies to break away from the accepted standards, it is effective as administrative control. In like manner, as it affords opportunity for desired self-expression, it affords control in the sense that it releases and guide the energy that lies back of personal aspirations to be well educated.

Thus it is seen that, when thought of as an administrative instrument, a curriculum not only plans, organizes, directs, and coordinates the actions of board, executives, supervisors, teachers, students, and parents, but it operates, also, as a control. It controls by providing a standard against which action and achievement are judged, while departures from it are penalized, and also, by serving as a guide to action. In establishing control of the curriculum, the power of law, of knowledge, and of social recognition all play a part. For any one person concerned—student, teacher, parent, or principal—the power of personal urge to self-development may also play a part. Knowledge creates and gives guidance for following the program; law gives it recognition and status with the government and the people; social standards and tastes establish important values in the mastery of it; and it stands as opportunity for personal aspirations to self-development.

10. More Specialized Controls through Technical Devices

Library catalogue as control. Aside from the book of rules as an over-all control and the somewhat comprehensive controls effected through the various units of organization and through the budget, the accounting systems, the salary and wage schedules, the building program, and the curriculum, there are many specialized devices for control of details. A number of these have been mentioned. The library catalogue, taken as a whole, is a comprehensive mechanism of control over the many separate items com-

prised in the library. As a whole, for a library of great size, the catalogue is as complicated as any curriculum and, in some ways, far more so. In a library of a million books, the catalogue provides ready directions for finding any item of which one knows the author or the title or the special or even general classification; and for experts, this is by no means all such a catalogue offers. The shelving of books is controlled by the mechanism of the catalogue system, as is the use and lending of books. Each book is thus under a number of separate controls, each designed to hold that book in readiness for use. In a public school, the library catalogue is simpler, but for any one item it stands as a ready control against loss and as a guarantee of ready availability and of proper use.

Personnel-record system as control. The cumulative record card for each student is a minor plan or device of control, in the sense that it provides a consolidated factual basis for passing judgment upon, or for deciding questions affecting, the student in question. Knowing that such a record exists, no teacher will advise a student on important matters without first seeing this background of facts. The child's teacher and his counselor use such a record constantly to control the advice they give. This record may often have an effect on promotion, on class or individual assignments, on cases involving discipline, on treatment of cases of personality difficulties, on health problems, on attendance, on choice of studies, on home study, and the like. Everywhere it is the stop, look, and listen sign. It prevents haste by compelling the traveller to read the signs before choosing the road he will follow.

The work schedule as control. The daily time schedule is a control device for guaranteeing a planned program of life and work and play for the school. Though it may not be followed slavishly, this program stands as a norm by which teachers can better judge what departures to make from it. For each pupil it helps to control both time and effort devoted to preparation of lessons and, to a large extent, it controls the work of school custodians.

Control through the school calendar. The school calendar is an over-all work schedule for all the schools together. It fixes a time schedule by days, but not specifically what shall go on through any one day. It controls vacation and attendance; with other records, it is a basis for control of the payroll; in many states it controls income, in part, by providing a basis for computing expected state income for attendance, and it controls many parts of the program for the maintenance or repair work on the school buildings.

Class register and other minor devices for control. The daily class register is a control by which a check is kept on the attendance of pupils; the child's report card is a control to guarantee that the parent is kept informed as to the child's progress in school; the specifications accompanying purchase orders or calls for bids are controls to guarantee that the price paid is properly related to what is purchased and that bids are, in fact, competitive. Each record and report form used is a control of some item of information or procedure by which a check can be made or a conclusion can be drawn. The inventory is a basis for control of equipment and supplies on hand and provides a basis for work on the budget for the ensuing year. A shelf inventory card is a minor control of the same sort, covering goods coming to and going from the shelf. A time clock or, more often, a less formal desk record, is a control device for checking the time of arrival and departure of those who use it.

The principle of control. The principle of control is seen in all our safety devices, such as banisters, door openers, escape ladders, fire extinguishers, fire walls, locks, vaults, specifications covering buildings or play apparatus; it is seen in the arrangement of the floor plan of a building—providing exits and entrances, in their provisions for separating groups or departments, in their provisions for the easy flow of traffic and for getting things together to fit living and work demands; it is seen in the arrangement of a dictionary and other reference works, in a title page or an index; and it is seen in the layout of the playground. Everywhere the

principle of control is the same, though the device through which the principle is to be applied must vary greatly with the nature of the thing to be controlled.

We apply control to acts of people, to sources and uses of funds, to use or to obtaining or to care of supplies and equipment, to facts or records, and to procedures. We control people through contracts, assignments, amount of compensation (rewards and deprivations), professional recognition, and social approval, applying the power of law, of fact, and of publicity, as the case may require.

In the shaping of a system of controls, it is apparent that law can be used as the power of control in many different forms—statutes, board policies, official decisions or orders, contracts, assignments, authorizations, all in endless variety. If the board authorizes a policy, a plan of organization, a job assignment, a course of study, a budget, a purchase order, a record form, a building plan, or even a report card, there is in each of these the power of the law. The administrator who is ingenious can think of many devices to fit many kinds of work wherein the power of law is essential as the power of control. What is true of the power of law is equally true of the power of fact or knowledge and of the power of social and professional approval.

As electric power can do many kinds of work, but for each kind must be applied through a specialized device, so it is in administration with the power of law, the power of fact, and the power of social approval. More than this, in the field of management each case is likely to be complicated by the fact that, whereas a device may be designed for applying the power of law, it often is not possible to prevent the other two forms of power from working on the case. It is for this reason that social science is so much more difficult than physical science. The person who applies the power of the law is nearly certain, in some manner and degree, to apply other forms of power, along with that of law.

11. Applying the Control Principle in Management

Choosing what power to use for control. In practice, one has the task of discovering what to do, then, of doing it. Whatever a given task may be, it represents work; and to do work, some kind of power must be applied. Good administrators do not sit in office chairs and wait for work to come to them. Instead, they have programs of work laid out, programs that are both continuous and changing—continuous, because schools go on, generation after generation; changing, because of the complications of the facts of individual differences and of social change for what education requires.

Whether one is engaged in finding and defining the work that is to be done or in planning for or performing it or, later, in evaluating what has been done, he will require the use of authority and a means or a method for applying the power of authority to the task. Whether he moves in terms of the authority of law or by application of knowledge or by use of social standards or by an inner urge to self-expression will depend upon two factors—the nature of the work and of those who do the work, and the administrator's personal will in the case. Personal choice of what power to apply or to rely upon in a given task may have some range, but it is clearly not unlimited. To establish a contract requires the power of law. To perform a technical service requires the use of knowledge. To maintain morale in staff or student body requires the use of ethics and the system of proprieties of the time. To achieve the best in teaching or counseling, one must be driven by personal zeal for high attainments.

Personal interests may conflict with control. In choosing what power to apply, if directing, or what power to depend upon, if controlling, in a given case, one may often find the four forms of power competing in his mind for place. One's personal wish to achieve a certain end may cause him to apply the authority of his office rather than that of logic and

fact or, possibly, that of professional ethics. Many of the weaknesses of administration lie in the use of the wrong kinds of power. In many cases, several forms of power may be required and often two, or even all four, are found working together. In such cases, a right proportioning is important, for each form effects control in its own special way only.

It is one thing to be wise enough to analyze the work and to determine what power or powers are needed; but it is a different thing to choose and apply at each point and stage what the case calls for. It is at this point that the whole personality, not just one's understanding alone, asserts itself. One's personal likes, one's sensitiveness to friendly requests for favors, one's fears that his decision may make him lose favor with his board—these are ever present, to claim a place in the decisions.

Choice of power indicated by the nature of the work. Here, our choice of power is the power to effect administrative control, control of people or of materials, of relationships, or of procedures. If, as was above noted, the power must be chosen to fit the work, the first step would call for a study of the problem. What is the nature of the work, of the question to be settled? If, for instance, it is a question of personal or property rights, it will call for the power of law. If it is a question of facts or of principles or of reasoning, then the power of knowledge alone would solve it and the power of law would be of little avail.

Diagnosis of a problem in management would begin by a review of the facts and circumstances of the case in the light of the purposes to be served. If the spending of funds had been questioned, diagnosis of the case would start with a review of the budget, the device by which spending was supposed to be controlled. If an audit showed adequate records and no violation of the budget, then the difficulty might be with purchasing or storage or distribution or use of the things purchased. Control of all these matters might prove to be consistent in plan and intent with the budget,

but to be inefficiently applied. Controls over these matters would include the shelf-inventory system—the records and forms for requisitioning, receipt, and delivery of materials at the storehouse or at schools and the management of the local consumption of the materials.

A look at these various devices and processes will show that they are designed to work together; that control of spending involves the use of a complex system of devices designed to keep check on every step in the process, from budget plan to actual use of the purchased goods or services. The budget represents legal control; but over the later steps in spending, the power of the law has to be supplemented by the necessity of recognizing the facts and circumstances that surround the schools where the purchased materials are consumed.

This illustration of how control over one item or feature or process in a school system is so connected with the control of other features or processes that one must think in terms of systems of control, rather than of individual cases, could be duplicated in other areas than that of finance. To control instruction requires a curriculum, a plan of guidance, a system of records, a work program, a marking system, graduation standards, and many other devices. Unless all these controls are effective and harmonized, control over instruction is ineffective. Thus, the choice of the form of power to be used must be with reference to the whole problem.

Diagnosis of a problem would bring to light the full nature of each of its elements, of the relationships among the elements, and of the function that each element is to perform—all in the light of the ends to be achieved and of the environmental conditions to be met. For any given case, the choice of what power to use—single or with other forms—at each point, might be obvious; or it could be difficult, depending upon the complexity of the work involved. In case of a contract, control could hardly be effected without application of the force of the law. That far, choice

would be simple. However, a contract to construct a building must include extended specifications in writing and in blueprints. These plans represent the conclusions of careful studies of the children to be housed and of the program of life and work to be cared for. To some extent, also, the plans are likely to reflect public opinion, which, in turn, is formed in part by the pressure of the personal habits and tastes of the individual citizens who voted to have the building erected. Thus, to carry through the project to the point of establishing contract control, all four forms of power will have been applied. The control alone may appear to be essentially by force of law, but knowledge has been used to define how the law is to be met and, besides law and knowledge, there is public will and the personal attitudes of citizens that could be counted upon to support the enforcement of the contract. That these social forces count for control is evidenced in the reluctance shown by individuals and corporations to arouse any unfavorable public opinion.

The human element the same in all phases of administration. From this it is apparent that, in establishing control, administration has to deal with the same human elements that are at once so useful and so dangerous to sound procedure in planning, organizing, directing, and coordinating. Human interests may sometimes run counter to the dictates of science or of good taste or of justice. Law and fact and principle are impersonal, but they are of effect in administration only when they are brought to bear by persons. Whether the person is an executive who shapes the decision or an employee who executes work in terms of it, he often is in position to apply his own personal power, backed by self-interest, in lieu of the power of his office, which power is backed by the interest of the schools.

Here, as elsewhere throughout previous chapters, the answer is, first, to get good people—well trained, zealous in their work, physically vigorous, ethical, and socially skilled—and to trust them; second, to follow the practice of rule

by law, rather than by person, whenever that is practical; third, where, by the nature of the work, personal rule must be employed, try as far as possible to establish controls by which its effects can be evaluated.

Choosing a device. In choosing what power is to be applied, thought must be given to the means of applying it, as well. The power of legal principles, as such, would be difficult and impractical to apply as a guide in developing a school system. When these principles are set forth in a statute, one has a pattern or a set of specifications, whereas before, he would have had only a philosophy. To apply philosophy to one's work requires great wisdom; to apply a set of directions, much less. With the directions, even a wise man could move faster in his work.

The power of law can be applied through a number of different devices. A statute, a rule, a contract, a record, a plan—anything, in fact, that has been officially authorized or empowered for a given purpose. Knowledge may be of facts or principles, or of methods of getting facts, which provide the key to meanings of things or the reason for acting or not acting in a given situation; it may be knowledge of what, of how, of why or where, or of when action should be taken or withheld; knowledge may be directly evident to the senses or available only through reasoning or remembering; it may be in writing or in any other form. To bring knowledge into use in administration, we devise standards, rules, policies, formulae, schedules, programs, plans, charts, forms for records and reports, guides to information, catalogues, and the like. The budget, the accounting system, the annual report, the book of rules and regulations, the salary schedules, the course of study, the organization chart, the daily work schedule, the scholastic record system, the library catalogue, the house organ, the child's report card, and the teacher's register furnish controls over much of the management. They do this, in part, because they are the official guides and represent authority; in the main, however, they control merely by making knowledge and standards

available for use. A teacher seldom thinks of authority when he reads the course of study; he reads for directions that will help him to keep his work in line with the school's program. The point is that, in most of these devices for control, the element of authority is so completely in line with the purposes of the teacher who is controlled by them that the user's reaction to them is not that of obeying or submitting to authority, but rather, that of getting information to apply to the work he is doing. He looks at them not for the authority, but rather, for the right way to proceed in his work.

It is obvious that when a device functions through two or more forms of power the user may stress one form at the expense of others, to the detriment of good management. In requisitioning materials for use in a school a principal cannot overlook the authority of legal regulations. If his needs should exceed the budget allowance, however, the budget, as law, would not help him decide which needs to purchase for and which to omit. In this case, the budget must function as a plan of educational service. It is this plan, not the force of law, that affords the basis for judging what to buy.

This may serve to show that in shaping control devices we must not lose sight of the fact that most of the devices have to be used by people; few of them function automatically. At best, therefore, control is relative. Even though few controls compel with certainty, quite often they put us in a position in which we can know the right action to take or the value of the action we have taken; sometimes, also, they can be made to expose our errors—and for fear of this, we hold by choice to right action.

To prepare a control device, then, one would ask: "What persons, things, or processes are we to control? To what ends is control to be directed? By what forms of power may such controls be effected?" The kind of work to be done in the case—the things to be controlled, plus the purpose of control—will suggest what forms of power will be required and, together, the work and the power should give

a clue to the type of device needed. If one wishes to control a library for use, he will need control for quick finding of books and against loss of them, control against damage to property, and control over behavior in reading rooms. Besides, the ownership of the books must be identifiable. The cataloguing system (catalogue cards, acquisition number, shelf number and classification on the book, perforated stamp for name of library) provides several devices for identifying ownership and for locating the book in the library. This system provides identifying numbers and letters by which records can be kept of books loaned. Control, here, is mainly through a system of information; abuse of books would be controlled by a library rule, with a penalty for infringement. Behavior in the library would be controlled mainly by personal taste and will and by social properties and library customs. Legal power lies back of all; however, in most of these cases, control is not a task of compelling, but only of informing and of allowing opportunity for free use of self-control and for control by social usage.

If the control machinery and the control practices of most of our school systems were carefully examined in light of the analysis of the control function as outlined in this chapter, it seems reasonable to believe that the function of control would be more clearly understood and provided for in management, that there would be a wider and more intelligent use of control by knowledge, that there would be less control by authority and correspondingly more use made of social control and personal freedom or self-control, and that the net result would be better control.

12. *Summary of Steps in the Analysis*

To bring the substance of this examination of the function of control into brief space, we would have the following:

1. Control as a function of management may be thought of in two ways: (*a*) As the exercise of power to restrain or to direct or to determine what may happen in a given case.

(*b*) As a basis by which one may evaluate the merit of something, or judge the implications of some action or facts or principle or signs or conditions if applied in another situation. Both of these meanings are useful in a study of the nature of the administrative process.

2. Four separate aspects of control can be used as approaches to the study of control. These include study of the power that effects it, of the device through which the power is applied, of the process of applying the power, and of the end or purpose with reference to which control is sought.

3. Control can be effected, in either a general or a technical sense, by use of any of four forms of authority: authority of law; authority of knowledge; authority of social usage; or authority of personal attitude, habit, or will.

4. Power of any sort can be applied to work only if it is channeled effectively to the work. To accomplish this, devices have to be formed. A control device has to be suited to the purpose of control, to the nature of the work in which control is needed, to the kind of power best suited to the work, and to the process or form of activity by which power is to be directed upon the work.

5. The process of controlling may be personal and, so, subject to the will of an individual; or impersonal, subject to facts or conditions or forces that operate automatically by virtue of their existence.

6. The end or purpose of control must guide in the choice of power and of the device for applying the power.

7. Control by law may be general or specific. The more general it is, the more room it leaves for control by persons. For deciding technical matters, when action must be based upon specific facts and circumstances, the law must be general, leaving refinements to persons who can know and decide in light of the facts of the case. Control by law may be *general,* establishing rights and duties, or things to do or not do; or it may be *technical,* in the sense of providing a

basis against which performance is judged or future action is guided.

8. Knowledge effects control by providing facts and meanings by which reason can calculate outcomes of possible action. Knowledge may be easily available in some cases; but it may have to be gathered by difficult and laborious effort, in others. Officers are likely to be controlled by knowledge in cases in which the public has easy access to the knowledge; although, when the opposite is true, the officer may be controlled by other more personal interests. As in the case of law, control by knowledge can be dodged in some cases.

9. Social and professional standards effect control in many matters, quite as effectively as do law and knowledge. One is judged by his conduct; knowing this, one acts in conformity with established norms. One conforms to propriety, partly because it is a matter of self-respect, of being comfortable and natural, of receiving social recognition as a person of culture; partly, too, from fear of receiving social disapproval.

10. Personal attitudes and habits, character and intelligence, and personality—the self—have drives from within that effect dependable controls. In this, people vary, to be sure, but there is something rather constant and stable about the values by which men conduct themselves—especially men who have risen to positions in the teaching profession. We count on this power and we judge our fellows by the standards they seem to live up to.

11. These four forms of power seldom operate singly to effect what we call technical control. Usually, two or more of the forms will be involved in any case. In such cases, administration should know what part each form is playing and make sure that the control, or controls, he depends upon are the ones that relate to his purposes and to the nature of the work.

12. Special devices are needed, in order to channel power

to work. These devices are technical tools. As in carpentry or surgery, the tool must be designed to suit the process of conveying energy to work and for applying the energy in a way to perform the work without damage or undue labor.

13. Examination of a considerable number of such devices revealed that, because of its variety, educational work requires a large number of them; that, in the main, they are highly specialized in terms of purpose, the persons or kinds of things they control, the process of applying them, and the form of power they are to apply; that many of them are designed as much for use in direction or coordination or planning or organization as they are for use as controls.

Considerable study is needed in this area if we are to understand the principle of control and be skillful in the use of it. We tend to confuse power with device and control with other forms of administrative activity.

Part II

The Nature and Use of Certain Forces Essential in the Administrative Process

Chapter 7. THE NATURE AND PLACE OF AUTHORITY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Part I having identified the several elements that make up the administrative process, it becomes necessary for Part II to reveal what can be found out about the power that energizes the process. This and the three succeeding chapters undertake an analysis of that power, the purpose being to discover what different forms of power are used, where each comes from, how they may be used separately and together, and how they may be misused.

In our analysis of the administrative process so far, it has been shown that administration is continuously motivated and energized by other forces besides that implicit in the authority of law. It remains to inquire more fully into the nature of these several forms and sources of power to show how they may or must operate separately and together, and how administration can make proper uses of them. Accordingly, in this chapter four different forms of power are isolated and are identified, and three of them are examined at some length. The four include the authority of law, of knowledge, of social usage, and of personal preference, each of which is shown to be the actual power that shapes action or decision in administration. Three of these are examined at length, the fourth—social usage—is reserved for separate study in Chap. 10, after the practical working of these different forms has been examined in Chaps. 8 and 9.

After each of these forms of authority has been identified and shown to exist as a practical fact in shaping decisions

and orders, the study turns to a closer examination of the nature of legal authority as the foundation of power, without which the other forms could not operate. Its source in the state establishes not only control but also a basic philosophy for the management of the schools to observe. Authority to command is shown to have limits, for it must respect authority to teach and to supervise. Study of the way these are to work in harmony and not in conflict reveals important characteristics of the legal authority available to the administrator. Study of the way the law is related to custom and tradition shows how the power of social usage is, in fact, interlocked with law. The authority of law was found in two forms: that of written law and that of discretion. The latter was found to be necessary because of the complex nature of education. This was shown to mean that the law provides discretion in order that science may enter as the guide to action. The place of the authority of knowledge is large because the details of school management cannot be prescribed in advance. Thus the power of law, written and discretionary, is found to be closely interlocked with that of social usage, that of science, and that of personal taste.

Following this analysis, a number of case studies were made, the purpose being to find just how the ideas and concepts discovered in our analysis could be made use of in practice. The results seem to show that administration can profit by a clearer understanding of (1) the nature of the administrative process, including the power that energizes it; and (2) the nature of the work to be done. Neither of these, without the other, can be an adequate guide to administrators.

1. *Administrative Power Includes More Than the Authority of Law*

General notions about authority. No one familiar with public education ever thinks of a public school system as operating without authority. Perhaps no one thinks of that authority as quite the same as the authority one senses in

the army, in a courtroom, in a police office, or in any of many other types of government offices or bureaus. Authority appears to be thought of somewhat in terms of the kind of function it is set to perform.

In public schools, as in other government service, we are accustomed to thinking of authority as being assigned to offices and as exercised by the holders of the offices. Some offices have wide powers and others, very limited powers. As in government elsewhere, the school offices are arranged in hierarchical form, by which the powers of each office are subordinate and responsible to the powers of the office next above, all centering finally in the single office of chief executive. This hierarchy concept, widely familiar and in common usage, applies as much to the responsibility as to the authority of office.

This idea that authority is attached to responsibility, to the kind as well as the extent of responsibility, enters into the general picture we have of authority in any given case.[1] The sense of respect we all feel upon entering a public office attaches to both the power and the responsibilities of the office. To determine the real nature of that respect, in any given case, would require extensive psychological study. In an autocratic government, such a sense of respect might be strongly tinged with fear and dread; in a truly democratic country, it would contain elements of honor and esteem and personal pride.

Further to clear the way for our study of authority, some help toward understanding these generally accepted notions about the powers used in administration may be gained from a closer look at just what the administrator makes use of in doing his work. To what do these commonly accepted notions of administrative authority attach? Power is not

[1] In his studies of legislation, in the part concerned with principles of the penal code, Jeremy Bentham has examined the use of the concept responsibility as it applies in legislation. See, especially, Chap. VII. In many other parts of his book, Bentham deals with precisely how legislators may be made to feel responsible. See his *Theory of Legislation.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1864.

anything mystical to be conjured up for use at will. It is always the power of something or somebody. Whether power resides in a law or in a person has to do not with the fact of power, but with the control of its use. First, however, a brief definition may be useful as a means of identifying authority, which is the object of our study here.

Definition of authority in government. By the word authority we commonly mean the power to decide or to command. Such power, however, is power of something—in this case, of the state. The compelling force of authority in government derives from the physical power of the state. When the government wants work done, it creates an office and endows that office for the purpose and with the authority needed to perform the work. When the office is occupied, the occupant is in charge of that authority and, by virtue of its power, can command and decide as the work of the office may require.

The power to command in affairs of business appears to be different from this, only because we forget that ownership of property is also a right created and enforced by the state. So it is in case of parental authority or authority in a social club. These parental and social powers may seem far from governmental, but the rights of such offices are finally enforceable only in so far as they are legally based.

This power to command, this authority of law, is never totally separated from other influences. After all, laws are written, interpreted, and administered, by people. They are made to be used in the affairs of the people. They define modes of conduct whereby the people may be able to live and work together and enjoy their lives. School laws were designed to govern schools. They were established only in order to make it possible for the people to have the kind of schools that they desire. So, authority is not a power from the outside. It is of our own world and is born of our most important, often our most personal, interests.

Other forms of authority. The term authority is used in a sense parallel to the above when we refer to a great

scholar, to a great treatise, or to a great legal decision, as an authority. Here authority derives from the power of knowledge. One can no more defy scientific than he can defy legal authority. Facts add up; the laws of nature will not down because they are based upon truth and fact. Law in government can defy, but it cannot alter, facts; nor can it prevent them from influencing the attitudes and feelings and will of the people.

There is yet another kind of force or form of power that operates as authority with us and which must have a place in our study of the nature of authority as we must use that term in administration. We use our moral standards, established traditions, customs, proprieties, tastes, manners, and forms of speech, as the norms against which we judge behavior to be good or bad. If one defies moral law, he is automatically penalized by public opinion, by being given a lower status as a member of society—that is, a member of less value to society.

Finally, since administration is carried on by persons, the way is opened for the use of personal power, of will, or of what, for short, we may term personality. Here, the taste, the understanding, the wishes, the prejudices, the likes and dislikes of the administrator can and do play a part in shaping decisions. It may be that these personal elements are modified by other forces—the law, public opinion, social norms, and facts—but they can find room for expression in administration, where action is so often open to personal choice.

These four types of authority not separate in administration. All four of these forms of power—the law, knowledge, social standards, personal tastes—are very old among civilizations. Each of them has grown up slowly, at first out of experience only and, later, by conscious effort. They all came in the struggle of man for existence, and each has become what it is because it could be used effectively in the changing kind of struggle man has had to make. Although each of these social instruments or forces must reflect the nature

of that struggle, it seems quite as obvious that they have, in turn, helped in a large sense to shape the struggle itself. As they came into use and developed together, it must be assumed that their present existence implies that they have operated more in harmony than in conflict and that this harmony is, as much as anything else, a fact about their natures. By developing and working together, they have to some extent lost a part of their separateness, each having in its own nature some of the qualities of each of the others.

Since school administration is born of legal authority and designed to give effect to it, since one can direct schools only by careful use of scientific knowledge, since the accepted way of life in our society must be the way of life for the school, and since authority is applied to work by persons, it follows that administrative power is, in reality, a complex of these four forces. To get at the nature of administrative authority, we shall need to examine each of these forces at somewhat closer range, both separately and together.

2. *The Nature of the Authority of Law*

Difficulty of separating the four elements for study. From this breakdown it appears that, in practice, the authority of one's office is but one of several sources from which an administrator derives the power—the composite of energies that shape his decisions and actions and through which he gives direction to behavior of others. The presence of each of these elements in administration seems obvious when attention is called to it as such, though they are less easily recognized when one looks at a decision or at an order or even at the process, as it is going on. Cross sections taken at different stages of the administrative process would undoubtedly show widely different combinations of these four forms of energy—the law, science and philosophy, the public demand, and the personal will—as they are actually at work in the administrative process. The question is, Can they be separated for study without destroying or omitting some important element, quality, or characteristic of the

thing we think of and really see at work as administrative power?

It will be well to approach our task with such a risk in mind, for then at each step care must be taken to determine whether what we observe of an element in isolation is identical with what it would reveal when at work in combination with other elements.

Legal authority is easily pictured as a separate and distinct thing. It may often seem to be quite impersonal, objective, and detached; to have unalterable qualities and characteristics; to be hard and unyielding; to represent permanence and finality. On the other hand, we are familiar with the idea that laws change, that new laws are constantly developing and old ones being repealed, that on the meaning of the laws our ablest judges often disagree. Among our legislative authorities, there is wide disagreement too, as to what we should and should not try to control by the power of statutes.

Clearly the authority of law can have only such characteristics as the law imparts to it. Is authority the essence of the law, or does the law provide other things besides authority? Can authority be created in terms so precise that use of it can be clearly and completely forecast? How separate is it from that which limits it? Often our laws are general in form, leaving wide discretion to the officer in charge. Clearly, the nature of authority, in such a case, the authority by which our public services are so largely administered, is not so simple, so single and elemental and obvious as a layman's first impression might seem to indicate. If a law provides for the use of discretion, it provides for the entrance of some force other than the authority of law. That is, the law purposely avoids the attempt to control by legal power alone.

Legal authority cares for many different kinds of service. The public school, of any and all grades and types, is a creation of the state. As an enterprise of the government, it rests upon constitutional, statutory, charter, or other spe-

cial forms of law. Whatever is done in the formation or operation of the school is an expression of that law. Selecting teachers, preparing a school budget, keeping school records, teaching a class, binding the wounds of a child hurt in the school gymnasium, preparing food in the school cafeteria, cleaning the floors, and firing the furnaces are, alike, acts performed by the authority of law.

If we think of authority as power to decide and to command, it is apparent that we are thinking mainly of how authority is used in administration. If we think of what decision and command have to do in teaching, in supervision, in research, in school nursing, in guidance, in record keeping, in the custodial services, we note a different emphasis. The teacher does direct the students, the supervisor and the research expert may participate in organizing the work of their own fields, the school nurse directs children during health inspections, the chief accountant and the registrar exercise command over the way accounts are kept, and the custodian commands his own tools and directs the work of his own realm. In all these areas, the activity includes some use of authority as command, but it is more in the nature of carrying out the command that is implicit in the law creating the positions they hold, or that comes to them from a superior officer.

There are two points here to note. First, the law has created authority to act, to perform a defined service, and to direct others in the performance of service. This may mean only that power to command is the same, whether it applies to one's own activities or to those of subordinates. The point of interest here is that it is the authority of the law that makes all forms of action possible in the school. It is by authority of law that each and all employees perform their duties. It is by authority of law that children attend school and that parents pay taxes for the support of schools. The authority of law is, in a manner, the principle that gives life to the school enterprise.

The various forms or divisions of authority must act in

harmony. With authority separately devoted to so many different forms of service as it is in an educational enterprise, the question of mutual support for each other among the services—or, possibly, of conflict—might arise. Does authority flow from the law to these many parts of the school as water from the rain to the roots of flowers in the garden? In part, perhaps, but not entirely. Though each employee is endowed with authority to do his own work, the question of what his work is; how it is related to other work; what are its objectives, its nature, its extent; when and where it is to be carried on; what facilities it may have; what standards it must observe must take account of other services. Supervision cannot be effective if it does not go on harmoniously with all the many services that directly affect teaching and learning. Purchasing could not be intelligent if requisitioning power were denied to teachers, principals, and others, who alone can judge what supplies and equipment are needed in their own work. The teacher must be free in his teaching. For this, authority must be abundant. But the connection of teaching with these other matters is not teaching alone, or supervision alone, or business management, or research, or guidance, alone. Yet, because the teaching is not effective unless these connecting links between it and each of these other services is efficiently made, a way must be found to keep these connections healthy and effective.

This suggests how the authority to teach or to counsel or to keep records must be real authority; but it suggests, also, that by the very nature of these services, this authority must not reach a point at which it dictates to other services. Each service must be as free within its own field as any other. Instruction, supervision, research, guidance, medical service—these are services based upon extensive scientific specialization. They can be efficient only if they are free to be scientific. The authority that these officials require is that which safeguards their freedom to act as technical experts. Of power to command they need little, and that

little reaches only to matters that must be closely fitted to the scientific activity.

To get harmony among services, coordination is necessary. By this approach, it is easy to see that for a school system to exist and operate there will have to be many decisions made to settle the questions that have to do with matters affecting the many relationships between services. This is a function of management. This function is not suggested here as something that comes before these technical services or that is superior to them or that is external in its origin; it is suggested as something that derives from the nature of the school system itself, with its many special services.

This approach to the study of authority appears in contrast to the idea that authority is from the law. Here, we look at the school system and the work to be done and, by study of it, discover a need for power to bring a host of separate specialized activities into harmony, power to give direction and scope to each, power to provide facilities for and to judge whether to extend or retract in each. Thus, by study of education, we extract specifications for the function of administration and for the kind of authority required to do its work. This throws a different light upon the nature of administrative authority, and we shall need to make sure where it leads us.

The law is a very practical and indispensable fact in all government work. The law alone provides authority for the creation and operation of public schools. If the authority of law is withdrawn from a district, the schools of the district are automatically out of existence as public schools. Putting it the other way around, what the law says is authority. The extent and kind of power in government are fixed in laws. Whoever holds public office and exercises official powers is both limited and empowered by the law that created his office. This fact about where our authority comes from is not altered by the fact that we sometimes have to resort to courts to find precisely what authority a law provides.

Can it be that the needs for authority are to be extracted from the nature of the school work, with all that this would mean for the nature, the quality, character, and behavior of authority; and at the same time, that authority is created by and resides in laws only? This, it would appear, is precisely the case, even though on its face the conclusion may seem to depend upon something like Plato's idea that at some time a statesman would appear who was also a philosopher.

Where does the law itself come from? For answer to this, we must turn to those who are schooled in the science of jurisprudence. Many and somewhat varied answers are to be found in the many books, ancient and modern, on the history and philosophy of law. From a study of these sources even a layman can gain some little understanding of how law has evolved; how it has been used by lawyers and jurists, as well as by administrators; and what it has been made of.

In its earlier form, law was scarcely separable from religion and morals as a means of social control.[2] Not only were the three used together interchangeably as forms of social control, but in their origin they seem to have had a common ancestry in the needs of the individual and of society, as life had to go on. They are merely three types of motives expressing the individual's feelings. During the Middle Ages, the law of government shared control about equally with the law of the church. The state, however, has since very largely taken over the function of social control, but without denying a place for both morals and religion. The law has, in reality, absorbed many of the essential elements of religion and morals and, so, has put the physical power of the state back of them.

[2] Cf. Roscoe Pound, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. See also his *Law and Morals; The McNair Lectures, 1923.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1926. Also Felix S. Cohen, *Ethical Systems and Legal Ideals.* New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., 1933. Also Benjamin Cardozo, *The Growth of the Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924.

This greatly oversimplifies the story of the origin and growth of law, but it may serve to provide a picture that is accurate in one important particular. Law grew out of society's need for a way of adjusting disagreements between individuals, and for some means whereby an individual could know in advance what would be expected of him, and also what he could safely assume about the behavior of others. Whatever, by the give-and-take of life, came to be custom and tradition in conduct, that represented the morality, the acceptable, the right, the appropriate behavior. The law in a sense absorbed this concept of right and wrong in the case and put the power of the state behind it. Thus, the stuff of which law is made is both social and individual and comes out of the circumstances, conditions, and ways of life among the people. The power of the state, of the people, was not created merely as power. It was created to do work. When the state was the peoples' best means of doing the work, then, what may have been a social custom at once became the substance of a law.

When a way of life has become a tradition that exists as a moral standard of behavior, it has great power over people. When that tradition is written into a law, it does not suddenly lose the power it had before. People will obey such a law quite as much by force of the respect they have for the tradition as by force of the power of the state which it has taken on.

No doubt the particular power that motivates action in a given case will depend upon the individual. Some people will defy custom, or even morality, who may respect—or perhaps, fear—the state. Others may hold accepted custom in such esteem that to them the power of the state is a lesser deterrent to an unlawful act. To such a person the act is not only unlawful, it is first of all immoral or irreligious, or perhaps, an important impropriety. Thus it appears that we have available several forms of power by which we govern our conduct—the power of law, of custom, of tradition, of morality, of religion—and that law is often no more

than a formal declaration of the will of the state to enforce by political power what stands already among the people as social power, as an accepted way of life.

A closer look at these forms of social control. Since, historically, law came as an added means of social control, to supplement the power of religion and morality and instinct, a closer look at these forces may be helpful. Each of them has a restraining effect upon the thoughts and conduct of the individual. Each of them behaves somewhat as if it were a form of energy, ready to appear on the scene when conduct takes on a form disregardful of what the law stands for. What is this energy and where is its source? One may say that his conscience tells him, that the police or his knowledge of the law tells him, or that his reverence for the church or for religion tells him, or that he knows instinctively. Are these forces within us and of us, and do they merely represent our reactions to stimuli? Or are they wholly external in origin, standing ready to tempt or compel us as the situation requires, to come as something inseparable from the situation that calls for our choice of a way to act—something that may be dictating which way we shall choose?[3]

One may choose to act lawfully rather than unlawfully because it is his own personal preference, because he feels pride in being a good citizen, because he believes in his state and what it stands for, because he desires social approval, or because he fears the penalty of the law. If one is moved to do right because of his own sense of self-respect, or even from his pride in his social standing, he may think of the law as existing for people of low taste and doubtful character and not at all for him. He may feel that society can safely trust him to do right. Because only a few people know of his staunch character, however, the majority can

[3] John Dewey's "Search for the Public" and "Discovery of the State" provide a well-reasoned foundation for these statements. See his *The Public and Its Problems.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1927.

feel safe against the possibility that he may do wrong, only when their laws provide such assurance. This is partly because society controls the law but can have no say as to how self-control may operate.

Even if all men were believed by all to be good and strong of character, it is well known that such strength is relative. To steal would not greatly tempt one who is well bred, well fed, prosperous, and contented; but when fortune is reversed and he feels lonely, hungry, without friends, and helpless, his attitude toward theft often changes. These inner controls—self-respect, sense of honor and decency, love of justice, feeling of patriotism—are not so completely within and of us that they are entirely detached from the world outside. These standards—moral, aesthetic, religious—have been built into man's inner self largely because they were useful in his life among his fellows. By being good he won the respect of others. That respect was a form of security that gave him personal satisfaction. By being kind to others, he found others kind to him.

In so far as one is a wise and devoted citizen, it would be reasonable to assume that for him the command of the law is paralleled by the command of his own inner self. One must know the right, however, if he is to do the right. In a culture as complex as ours, it is not always easy to know the right. So, although one could do right or wrong from choice, he could do either, also, from ignorance or from indifference. It was to protect people against all these kinds of wrongdoing that laws were developed. So, it is as much a function of law to inform as it is to command, or to reward or punish. In one case, the authority of law authorizes, in the sense of defining the accepted right way for conduct; in another, it commands, in the sense of ordering what to do or not to do in a given case. In the first of these functions law has much the same purpose as science, *i.e.*, to provide knowledge as a guide to action. It differs, however, in the fact that within the law there is the added ele-

ment of finality, of must, that tells you to follow directions and to think no further. In such a case there may be no penalty for not following the law, except that any other way would not have the force of the law to support it. Also, public opinion is usually with one who respects and follows the law.

It appears, then, that control by self and control by social forces are not so separate and exclusive of each other as they seem when we speak of biological control through reflexes or instincts, and of social control through laws or customs. Our customs and traditions and forms of speech and many of our attitudes and beliefs have developed in social atmospheres and have grown by our continuous responding to situations in terms of social values. They have become so much a part of us that we cannot easily defy them, even when we so choose. They constitute much of what we refer to by the terms personality and character. Then, many of our laws are but rationally formed expressions of the very same powers that have operated in our customs, proprieties, traditions, and beliefs.

A reflex, or instinct, acts in terms of physical, mechanical, biological power and mechanism; but many of these reflexes are prompted to action by social, as well as physical, stimuli. Law, as a social control, acts through political power; but one's reaction to law is often more an expression of the self than it is a reaction to the command of the law. The power that is strictly individual has to serve an individual who functions constantly as a member of a society. We like to believe, with Aristotle,[4] that a good man and a good citizen can be one and the same. Social power that helps to conserve and develop group life can do this only if it serves the individuals well enough so that they will be more interested in than defiant of society. Man is by nature social, and the state and societies are made up of individuals.

[4] *Politics,* Bk. III, Chap. IV.

Law is affected by social change. The nature of law is reflected somewhat by the attitudes of people toward it. Jerome Frank[5] has analyzed the struggle between our conflicting needs, which urge us, on the one hand, to seek permanence and security in our laws and, on the other, to strive for progress and betterment through a change in our laws. Social solidarity (mutual understanding and trust) is an indispensable basis of security for society, but failure to adjust to social change that could bring a fuller and richer life might lead to disaster. Thus, in writing its laws, a society finds itself in the dilemma of wanting both permanence and progress for its social order.

The longer one lives by a law or by any form of behavior, the more it seems to become a working part of him, as a personal attitude, habit, or feeling. It comes to represent some of life's values that are cherished for the sense of their fitness to the accustomed way of life. A new law which is a special legal formulation for a specific situation but which embodies an old custom or a traditional attitude is almost sure to be respected from the start, because it is familiar to all and fits in with everyone's sense of values.

It is natural that the old should be reluctant to change an existing law, even though social changes might clearly demand it, and that the young should be held less by the old law and attracted more to the possibilities of a change. This fact about human nature is significant for administration, for in applying the law these human tendencies may easily affect one's readiness to undertake new ventures or to give up the sense of familiarity and of security felt in the older ways. The authority of law might thus become strongly tinged with the authority of habit and personality.

In other words, if the authority of law is to be kept as the will of the people, it must be kept alive and sensitive to that will. It must be given new clothing, new interpretation, as new needs arise and the old and useless expressions of authority must be abandoned. Democracy, the people's state,

[5] *If Men Were Angels—Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

cannot be maintained without this. Law must grow; it must keep pace with the work it alone can perform.

3. *The Use of Authority in Administration*

Our framework of school law. As we think of our vast lawmaking machines—our congress, our forty-eight state legislatures, our many hundreds of cities and counties with their corresponding legislative bodies; the rule-making powers of our many hundreds of administrative bureaus and tribunals, state and national; or our vast systems of courts, whose decisions often produce what are, in effect, new laws—we realize that for us lawmaking is a serious business.

For the service of education alone, each of our states provides an extensive legal mechanism. In many states there is for this purpose a general collection of statutes. These statutes create the schools and provide for lay boards and other officials to direct their operations. The lay boards, in turn, are empowered by the statutes to provide rules for the regulation of the schools. State boards prepare such rules for state systems and district boards, for local systems. Statutes make the general provisions of constitution more detailed and, in their turn, are made still more specific by board rules for application to the schools of local districts.

School laws are specific but allow for discretion. These laws and regulations create the authority that administration must use. In creating authority, the laws fix limits about it. Authority is authority to do some particular service. Unless a service is provided for in the law, there is no authority available for use.[6] That is, in school administration, authority is not power given to a person to be used at will, but power given to an office that has been set up to perform a specified function. The office is made active not by a person, as a person, but by the person only as an officer. Obviously, such an officer can perform only such functions as were assigned by the law to the office.

It follows that, when authority becomes active through

[6] This principle has been established in numerous court decisions.

administration, it is necessary for the administrator to remember that he is not to confuse his personal with his official powers. Official power is state power, the power of an office, available to the administrator only as an official, and for use only as the law provides. It is presumed to represent the will of the people, not the whims or private wishes or prejudices or even the best intentions of any individual as a person.

Even with insistence that the authority of the law is attached to office and not granted to persons, and that it is limited to purpose and often to procedures set down in the law, it still has to be administered by individuals. It is an individual who starts the law on its round of doing work. It is a person who decides when, where, and how the power of the law is to act, in so far as these are not set down in the law. The law may be set to action in one case merely by the passing of time, as in case of a contract; but in the managing of a school, the law is not likely to provide such automatic initiations of the flow of authority as would be needed for arranging a curriculum or choosing a staff, or forming a policy to guide research for the schools.

In management there are many cases in which the need for applying authority must be discovered before the decision can be made how best to apply it. In such cases, the law cannot specify what action is to be taken and, so, has to leave to the officer the responsibility of finding out what the situation calls for. That is, in such a case as the above, authority of law is not a suitable kind of power for deciding what policy is called for; for this, science is a much better means. To make it possible for science to be used, the law purposely provides that it shall be the responsibility of the office, first to decide what to do, and then, to do it; that is, it provides the authority for using discretion.

Checks on the use of discretion. Here it appears that the law grants to an officer the power to act at will and, so, to provide for rule by man, rather than by law. This is true only in the fact that the person really does decide or act at

will and on his own initiative and understanding. It must be kept in mind, however, that in such a case the law has established responsibility for a service. It has authorized the use of only such authority as is properly required in the performance of the service. It is the responsibility side of the shield here that protects the state against the misuse of this personal power.

It is to be noticed also that, when the state grants discretion, it not only grants it for a specified purpose but, beyond this, provides other safeguards. It grants discretionary power to school executives and to teachers but sets limits to keep out those who are not known to have the training and personality needed to exercise discretion in these services. In order to teach, one must be certificated by law. The board is given power to make rules, but the law requires that such rules shall be reasonable. Thus, discretion is not only far from free to command at will, but it is granted for use only where it is needed and only to persons who are competent and trustworthy to exercise it, and tenure of office is terminable.

There is yet another check on the use of discretion, *viz.*, the demands of public opinion. When an administrator uses his authority in a manner that appears arbitrary and inconsistent with the responsibility of his office, it soon becomes an object of public discussion and criticism, which may grow so insistent that legal steps must be taken to determine his rights. The people may feel safer when their interests are protected by law; for at best, protection by use of public opinion is slow. Even so, it is to be remembered that our scheme of government and our social philosophy count upon public opinion to play a substantial part in safeguarding the rights of the people. Public opinion, once well formed, is in fact the will of the people. Its power to command is real. It does not formally represent the law; but it does represent the basic ideals, customs, beliefs, and will of the people, which it is the business of our laws to express and protect.

Discretionary authority is open to abuse. All this analysis of the nature of discretionary authority, with its control by law, by custom, and by public opinion, is sound enough as law and logic and social doctrine, but the fact remains true that it rests with the individual to make this theory effective in management. How can an executive know when he is moved to a decision more by personal wishes than by the real needs of the service? Or if he does know, how can he compel himself to act against his own interest in favor of so vague a thing as the good of the service? Does this not require an unusual person?

In case an executive is clearly commanded by law, he can act against his own personal interests, either because of his fear of legal consequences if he does wrong, or of his certainty of social approval if he does right. One or both of these motives may appear to prompt such action. When the power to act is within his own discretion, however, the fear of legal consequences is vague or lacking and the hope of social approval has a less tangible basis to start from. Further, with the leeway of choice available to him, through his discretionary authority, he has something to bargain with in dealing with people who want favors from him, or from whom he may want favors. Here his command of power is a source of temptation to use discretion for personal ends. Precisely how much temptation may be required in a given case to produce bad administration must depend in part upon the power to resist such temptation. This will vary with individuals and with circumstances. A strong pressure group with a plausible request is hard to resist, unless one can say that the law forbids it. If, in the particular case, there is no law to cite, then a dilemma has to be met. To grant the request, one must defy his proper responsibility; to refuse it, he must lose favor with the influential people who make the request.[7] Which shall it be? It must be concluded that, from the standpoint of the public,

[7] It seems that government by man must increase as our culture grows complex, that government by man tends to stimulate pressure-group activity, which in turn leads to a loss of power by the people

it is the nature of discretionary authority to be less constant and less reliable than that of law. Rule by man offers no complete assurance, in advance, of what a decision may be, or that any decision will be consistent with previous decisions. We may choose our executives with the utmost care, we may surround them with checks and balances, we may be convinced as to their abilities and character. With all these precautions, we still cannot be sure how they may perform in situations, yet unknown, that they will have to meet. Rule by man is as stable and as whimsical as man, man living under many and varied pressures.

Since, by the nature of educational work, it is necessary to use discretionary powers in order to bring the necessary intelligence into the work, our search should be for that combination of law, knowledge, and custom with discretion or personal rule which promises the wisest leadership at a risk that can reasonably be assumed.

How authority behaves. It remains to note one other characteristic of authority, a characteristic that is even more familiar to us in practice, perhaps, than in theory. Reference is to the behavior of authority in action. Authority as power to command can flow in but one direction, because otherwise it would tend to produce conflict and to cancel itself out. We commonly speak of the direction of flow of such authority as from superior to subordinate or from the top downward. The authority of knowledge can flow in any or all directions without producing conflict.[8] Real facts add up; and though some truths may cancel others, it is the final residue of truth that is important to management. What is true of the power of knowledge is true also of the power of custom and tradition and common beliefs and aspirations and public opinion.

It is clear that having these characteristics, authority to

as a whole in favor of individuals and groups. Law and a wiser and more complete plan of education would seem to be our proper answer to this.

[8] Reference here is to knowledge, not to opinion or judgment or prejudice or personal taste.

command must come from one source only (the state, the law) and that it must be controlled at every step from this single source. Whoever receives any such power must be held responsible to the source for its use or its delegation. Knowledge is in a sense its own control. Knowledge does not destroy itself by conflict with other knowledge; rather, it tends to perfect itself. This is true of custom and tradition, as well; but here, too, one must be cautious, for new times bring new customs that may conflict with older ones. This conflict is very real, for it expresses itself in competition between people who happen to have opposing preferences in matters involving use of custom. Of the power of knowledge, too, we have to remember a few things. It is developed by people, not by itself. It is applied by people. It cannot command an officer to use it. Opinion, judgment, and reasoning are a part of our system of knowledge, but they are often influenced by personal feelings.

4. Some Implications and Applications of These Ideas

So far, we have tried to learn about the nature of administrative authority by a study of its origin and by an examination of its observable characteristics. Our approach was, in part, genetic and historical and, in part, philosophical. The purpose was to examine the term authority as a concept and to try by a study of its ingredients to find what elements it includes, where these separate elements have come from, and what each contributes to the total composition. We may turn now to a functional approach and try to learn how authority performs. As an element in government, authority is only what it can do.

Restatement of the above reasoning. To bring the essentials of the above analysis together in few words, we may speak of administrative authority as the authority by which decisions are made, directions given, and actions taken, in management. By the above analysis, this authority is seen to be a complex of several influencing forces or forms of power, each capable of influencing people and, so, of use

in management. For public education this authority includes the authority of law, of knowledge, of social usage, and of personal desire and taste. Though they are easily distinguishable from one another, these four forms of power are closely bound together, both in their origins and in their uses as controls over people.

No individual ever has had a chance to be an individual without being also a member of a society and so no individual could have developed personal likes and ways of life in a world without people. Accordingly, the individual was forced to learn ways that did not too much conflict with the ways of others. As a result, what came to be a common language and a common way of life was both individual and social in its origin and content. Thus, law was seen to be related to custom and tradition, that is, to the past, as well as to existing social needs of the present and prospective needs of the future. Accordingly, when it is in use, law represents the physical power of the state, in combination with the influence of personal habit and taste, the pressure of such social forces as go to make up the accepted way of life, and the power of fact and logic. That is, the compelling physical power of the law is not administrative authority's only means of getting work done. In most cases, no physical power is used or even thought of as a reason for obeying a law. In the administering of law, there is seldom any display of power except as a form or symbol. The reason is that in our form of society and government the purpose of the law is also the accepted purpose and will of the people. In such a case, the law operates primarily as a guide to inform and as an agreed-upon and fully acceptable manner of action.

It was noted also that the authority of law is essential as much to one part of school work as to another. The teacher has authority to teach; the clerk, to keep records; the supervisor, to supervise; and the administrator, to administer. Each service is related to others, and it is a function of administration to keep the parts of the system in har-

mony. In using authority to this end, the executive is not expected to interfere with the authority to teach or to do research or to supervise.

It was shown, further, that law cannot prescribe action in great detail for a complex service. In such cases, appropriate action cannot be foreseen but must first be ascertained by study. To make such study possible, the law provides for responsibilities and allows discretion as to choice of ways to meet them. This makes possible a larger application of knowledge in government, but it involves risk for the people, in that discretion opens the way for personal bias and for social pressure to affect the administration.

Administrative and teaching authority. In order to study administrative authority at work, it will be necessary to keep in mind four things: (1) the nature of authority, (2) the various people affected by authority at work, (3) the kinds of work it is used for, (4) the criteria by which we judge use of authority to be good or bad. The above analysis of authority will serve for the first of these. For the second, the people concerned, we have the administrator, those who take directions from the administrator, the children at school, and the public. For the third—kinds of work performed by administrative authority—we have each of the five types of administrative work: planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling. For the last—criteria of good and bad usage of authority—we shall need to see that the nature of authority is not violated and that the nature of the work to be done is properly respected.

Administration is responsible for the proper execution of the school law as the school board authorizes. This applies to all work that has to be done and to the materials and personnel required. If there is one service that is more a point of departure for administrative thinking than any other, it would be classroom study and teaching. To the end that children may be cared for and instructed, all else is but a means. In administering (planning, organizing, directing,

coordinating, controlling) the teaching service it is important, therefore, that authority shall be used with proper understanding of teaching objectives and processes. How best can one apply the authority of law, of science, of social usage, of personal taste, separately or in combination, in his management of this most important service?

In this task, administration must interlock with teaching in a manner to facilitate and never to frustrate its own or the teaching activities. To put this in terms of persons, we have the superintendent with his central office experts, and the school principal, to render managerial direction and help; we have teachers and supervisors, assisted by research and guidance experts, to care for the teaching; we have the children to be taught; and outside, we have parents and the community, with special interests. Authority must function with respect to the proper interests of all these people and to the proper nature of all these services. In doing this, legal power must serve legal needs, science must provide knowledge and understanding, the public good will must be kept and brought to bear, and self-respect must not be sacrificed.

In order to see how our knowledge of the nature of authority and of the administrative process, on the one hand, and of the nature of the work to be done, on the other, can bring each of these elements into its place, let us examine a few cases wherein the authority of administration must function in conjunction with that of teaching.

For carrying on the work of a classroom and of a school, there must be a work program by which pupils, teachers, counsellors, supervisors, custodians, clerks, and the principal may carry on their respective types of work in harmony. Such a work schedule is clearly an instrument of government. When completed, it is a part of the paper machinery of administration. Once adopted, it commands all employees. It directs their conduct; it organizes, coordinates, and controls their activities. The effect of such a schedule

is to administer. It has the effect of law at work. If the schedule is ignored and the work of the school is thereby interrupted, a further administrative problem will arise, *viz.*, that of reestablishing the schedule routine and of removing the cause of the breakdown. This illustrates how an administrative device becomes active and alive as a continuous order to all who are affected by it. In a way, it is self-administering, once authority has set it going.

As an administrative order, this would be quite as impersonal as any statute or board regulation. Suppose, however, the schedule proved to be disturbing to the proper handling of some of the instructional activities. Then the question of responsibility would arise. Whose order is this? Who made the schedule? Who can and should correct this weakness? Upon what basis would one proceed with such a correction? That administrative authority alone can empower the schedule is obvious. But, by what authority is the schedule constructed? Clearly, since the object of the schedule is primarily to facilitate the work of instruction, it must be formed in the light of the needs of instruction. Knowledge steps in to decide this—knowledge, in this case, of teaching needs.

Preparing an administrative rule, device, or order is one thing; empowering or authorizing and ordering it into effect is another thing. In the preparation of a work schedule, the authority of expert knowledge of teaching needs should guide action. To give the schedule official status requires the authority of law. It is in the confusion of these two tasks—preparing an order and giving an order—that many of the difficulties of management arise.

In scheduling teachers for playground supervision, the administrator, with the intention of being fair to all, may easily overlook such matters as personal taste or the health requirements of certain teachers. Such an administrative task is not alone a question of equity in dividing the work. It is a question of efficiency of the service as a whole. No teacher is efficient in doing work under order when he

knows that he should have been consulted before the order was given. The teacher possesses knowledge that should have been used in preparing the order.

In the old days, curriculums were made by superintendents, authorized by boards, and ordered into effect by superintendents. Since then, science has made a vastly different thing of the curriculum. It is no longer an outline of textbook knowledge alone. It is shaped in terms of the needs of the children, and of the homes and the community. The emphasis is not upon memory work alone and upon reasoning, but upon health and development, upon personality and character, as well. Without the intimate knowledge of the teacher and the counsellor, a curriculum could not be well made. Even if others could guess wisely at these needs, there is one thing they could not bring to the task. To be effective in teaching, a curriculum must be the teacher's curriculum and the children's curriculum. There must exist a sense of ownership, which not only provides understanding of, but also the feeling of responsibility for, the curriculum. This can come to a curriculum only when teachers, counsellors, children, and parents really contribute to its making.

Once the curriculum has been formed, provision for its administration must be planned. Here, again, it is not legal power but the power of knowledge that counts. What curriculum, what courses, what requirements as prerequisites, what electives, what scholastic standards, what measures of progress and of completion of work, what records kept—these are suggestions as to some of the administrative problems that relate to curriculum making. These things can be done in a manner that will facilitate the working of the curriculum and enhance its value, or they may become obstructions that literally change the meanings and purposes already built into the curriculum. The knowledge needed to settle all these questions is not alone the knowledge of finance, of enrollment statistics, of buildings, of available personnel, of library and laboratory equipment, or

of administrative theory. There is need, besides, for knowledge of children and community, of teaching and care of children. This knowledge the administrator does not possess in anything like the degree that the teacher, the counsellor, and the supervisor do.

When the curriculum has been made and the administrative machinery for it has been developed, it is ready for use. At this stage, it is no more than a plan or a proposal. To put power behind it requires legislative action of the board of education. This action makes it official but does not make it active. For that step, an executive order must be given. After such an order has been given, the curriculum is, in effect, a law; it then stands as a responsibility, definitely placed upon each and every person in the system who has any part in making it effective. The teacher's power to teach, granted to her by her contract and assignment, is by this order specialized through the objectives, organization, and content of the curriculum, and further directed by the administrative provisions affecting the working of the curriculum.

From these cases, it is apparent that preparing an order is different from issuing one—often, different in the kind of authority required to do the work, and different, also, in the sources from which the needed authority can best be drawn. It is apparent that, if administration moves in terms of the needs of the job, it will be using the authority of knowledge and of public opinion and of personal desire much more than it will use that of law. If administration does its work well, it will draw upon knowledge, personal taste, and public desire as the best sources in each case. If knowledge of teaching is needed, the administrator will call upon teachers to supply it; if knowledge of the desires of the people is needed, he will call upon citizens, social clubs, churches, and parent-teacher associations. If knowledge of finance is needed, he will turn to the business manager and, possibly, to the assessor's office, or to bankers and business leaders and the chamber of commerce and tax experts, depending upon the nature of the problem.

Administrative authority and administrators. As administrative authority must contact the authority of teaching, of research, of supervision, and of guidance, as has just been illustrated, it must also contact administrative authority. The principle upon which administrative power to command is distributed to the various divisions, parts, or units of a school system is that of the hierarchy. As has already been explained, this provides for the downward, but not for the upward or the horizontal, flow of the authority, the nature of legal authority being to flow downward only.

Before authority can travel, channels must be provided for its containment en route. These channels are provided by organization. Organization not only sets up offices as places of residence for authority, each with its special work and the power to perform it, but provides channels through which the office can dispatch power to perform work as needed in the different parts of its realm. An office is a center, but duties may have to be performed in places far outside the center—duties involving many other people and, perhaps, many other jobs. Officer *X* may have a part to perform in work being managed by officer *Y*. To do his work, *X* may need to send information or requests, or he may need to give orders. Officer *X* can command *Y* only if *Y* is his subordinate in the organization hierarchy. He can send information to *Y* or make inquiry of him, regardless of the rank of either.

If organization has done its work well, the realm of each office and, so, the powers of each person who has power will be clearly defined and there will be no overlapping or gaps to disturb the flow of authority. The channels of organization can be—properly, they must be—used for the flow of knowledge, as well as of command. The only difference is that knowledge can flow in all directions. If it should happen that organization has failed to provide a complete mechanism of channels for authority the result would be that *X* would protest to his superior that *Y* has infringed upon his, *X*'s, rights. Or, not infrequently, *A* calls his subordinate *B* for neglect of a given matter; *B* replies

that this is one of *C*'s duties and that *C* and not he is to blame.

To illustrate this, imagine the case of a principal faced with a serious case of inefficiency of a teacher. After trying in vain in every way he knew to help the teacher to improve, he finally told him that he would have to ask him to withdraw. He suggested that the teacher might succeed elsewhere and offered him the privilege of requesting a transfer. Upon the teacher's refusing to do this, the principal prepared a formal request and asked his superior, an assistant superintendent, for a conference. At the conference, he presented the request, but was told that he had been hasty, that it was not his business but that of the assistant superintendent to recommend transfers. Clearly, an impasse here would have the effect of permitting a teacher to flout the action of a principal. Or, if the principal were to go to the superintendent, let us say, in defiance of the assistant superintendent's refusal to go with him in the case, then there would be a serious clash between two administrators.

Little study of this case, a very common type of case, is required to locate the difficulty. Command clashes with teaching and, later, with command, bringing many bad immediate effects and many more to follow, as knowledge of the incident spreads. First, such a request should be made only in the light of facts. The facts should pertain to all aspects of the problem and should be reliable. On this point, who could know the facts as well as the principal? He should know the most about the case. His superior should know whether there was evidence that the principal had done his own part well. Whatever is done in the case should be done in the light of the children's needs, first, and then of the school's proper obligation to the teacher involved, not forgetting the effect upon the school and the community. In this case, the principal went to the right officer, he made a recommendation only. He was treated as if he had overstepped his authority and was refused a

request that the case go to the superintendent. Now, every employee has the right of appeal, based upon every citizen's right to petition.

In the case we are considering, the assistant superintendent seemed to think his right to decide included the right to provide all the information needed for making the decision. He was denying to his school principal the right to do a kind of work for which every principal is appointed, work that the principal is in the best position to understand and to judge. That is, the organization proved defective when authority was applied to a job. In this case, the assistant superintendent wanted to make decisions, the authority for which rested in the office of his subordinate.

For one further illustration, also familiar in practice, the following may be suggested. A teacher wishes a certain kind of paper for use in class and prepares a requisition for it. This goes to the principal, who, knowing his budget is low, asks the teacher to explain. Being convinced, the principal signs the requisition and sends it to the chief accountant, who checks it against the budget balance, O. K.'s it and sends it to the superintendent, who, in turn, approves it and sends it to the purchasing department. Here a would-be "watchdog of the treasury" scrutinizes the requisition and, instead of granting the paper asked for, changes to a kind that is "just as good, but costs less." When the paper comes to the teacher, it is useless for his purpose. Instruction has been spoiled to "save" a few dollars.

In this instance, authority to command, evidenced by signatures, followed the right channels down to the last, but along the way, "watchdog" assumed authority that was not administrative at all. What to buy was not questioned by the principal. His only concern was whether to buy or not and, if bought, how much. Decision upon what to buy was a function attached by its nature to the authority to teach. Saving money in such a case is not a matter of cost but of what was received for the money. Of this the teacher alone was in a position to decide.

One final illustration, to show where personality plays a part, may complete this review of authority in action. For this we might examine a case of fine leadership where personality counted but, instead, will take the case of a principal who overworks personality in an effort to gain popularity, through which he hopes to become an assistant superintendent. To do this, he thinks up a plan for greatly expanding his school program. He "sells" the idea to a few "key persons," mentions it as something for his teachers to think about, has a reporter in, along with some "key persons," and gets the idea written up for the papers. With his teachers only somewhat informed and little consulted, but with news clippings and the backing of his "key persons," he takes the idea to his superintendent; presenting the idea with more flourish than information, and assuring the superintendent that the people are back of it, he invites the superintendent to participate by "approval and encouragement." But the superintendent asks some questions: Where did you get this idea? What have your teachers to say of it? How would it fit in with the curriculum as it stands? How could this be done in your present plant? What new equipment and how many new teachers would it require? And what would it cost?

By the power of personal suasion and by the pressure of social approval, by "key persons," this principal hoped to bring his superintendent into line. But the superintendent knew education and administration, as well. He knew that, unless it had the teachers back of it the idea could not succeed—first because the staff would not be informed and, second, because the teachers could feel no real responsibility, having no sense of ownership in it. Further, to start a project without all pertinent facts was an indication of incompetency to carry on, even if the project were launched.

From these illustrations it appears that a study of the nature of administrative authority at work—that is, judging its nature by its behavior—reveals nothing beyond what was discovered by our analysis, except that it is easier to define the various elements of administrative authority as concepts

than it is to put the elements into their proper places and to assure their proper functioning in an organization. Power to command is often used when power of fact ought to prevail. The authority of knowledge does not always flow upward or outward in a hierarchy, as our theory indicates. The reason for this is that power of command sometimes gets in the way or prefers to use knowledge from other than the proper sources. This means that the authority of law ignores the nature of the work to be done in favor of a personal wish to rule in the case, or in order to assure the particular results wanted. So we have violation of the nature of administrative authority and, with it, violation of the nature of the jobs, by an ignoring of the proper requirements in the case.

This reminds us that authority in the hands of persons is not so constant as that which resides in law. The power of discretion makes indiscretion possible. Indiscretion may be due to many things: lack of knowledge, poor judgment, lack of skill, failure to take account of all interests involved; or it may be due to personal bias or to inability to combat social pressures.

It may likely be that we shall never find ways to secure the public against neglect, misuse, and abuse of discretionary power. We can hope, at least, to understand more fully the nature of this complex power we call administrative authority, and we can hope to understand better how to analyze our various jobs of work, so that by organization we shall put the right kind of power to the right kind of work and into the hands of the right people. This knowledge (examined at length in Part III) can affect our training and selection of people for administrative work, as well as the work itself. It can provide better criteria by which administrative work may be evaluated. Through these improvements, the dangers of abuse of authority are sure to become more hazardous for those who are inclined to laziness or to ignorance or to personal ambition in administration.

Chapter 8. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

In this chapter, our concern is with how the element of authority behaves in practice, the special problem being to find any possible rules or principles by which authority may be delegated in a school system.

The complexity of this problem of delegating authority is suggested by the fact that legal authority becomes effective only when put to work by officers, and by the fact that by its nature and its use the authority of law cannot easily set aside the authority of established traditions and social usage. That is, legal authority accomplishes administrative work only when personality, knowledge, and the cultural pattern operate along with it.

In the application of this complex of power, one other concern is with the fact that power, being specific, has to be fitted to the task. That is, the division-of-labor principle, applied in distributing authority, must correspond to its application to the work to be done. By reviewing the number and the wide variety of services required in a school system, it is apparent that, with the many personalities, many kinds of knowledge, and many social values involved, the delegation of authority is not simple. Some special difficulties arise also from the nature of the law, of the knowledge, and of the social standards themselves.

Analysis of the delegating function reveals four phases or steps: analysis of the work to be done, determination of the type of administration desired, provision for the use and flow of knowledge, and clear definition of the powers delegated.

Analysis of the work must reveal how and where management and performance can be specified and where power must be discretionary; what parts of it will require authority or knowledge or social standards to perform; and what is the nature of the work itself in terms of the types of activities involved.

The second step is concerned with the theory of administration, with the apportionment of responsibility to be borne by each of the three forms of authority.

The third step is concerned with ways and means whereby knowledge will be enabled—and, as far as possible, compelled—to function where it is needed.

The final step is to make the assignment; that is, to define the power and the responsibility and the ways in which each assignment fits into the whole.

1. *Nature of the Power that Operates the Schools*

Legal power the first essential. Our public school system—in state, county, and district, alike—is created and operated by laws. Any step taken to initiate or conduct schools must be taken in the name and by force of the law. It is by law that the purposes; the form or organization; the program of instruction; the plans for personnel, materials, and support; and the procedures for the conduct of the schools are established and energized. Rights to enjoy the benefits or to assist in the conduct of the schools are legal rights.

A school system in operation is a part of the state government at work. Although, as will be noted later, other forces than law may play a part, legal power remains the real power that turns the many wheels of the school machinery. The orders, decisions, and instructions given by the school board, the superintendent, the principal, the teacher, or the head custodian, each within its province, are the law in action.

Schools a feature of our government. This body of law has been built up slowly out of long experience and study.

Piece by piece, it has been shaped to fit changing needs. Much of it has been tentative and has had to be discarded or reshaped with time. Much of the time, our school laws seem clumsy and ill-fitting; even so, it is our law, our plan of school government; we made it and we made it for a chosen purpose.

In the management of our schools, it would be well if we should think of this legal force as friendly, as something that all members of the school staff possess and apply daily in their work, and not as a network of restraints, as something to be feared, as something forbidding; for we ourselves are the state, and this law is our will at work to do our special bidding. Most of our school law is positive and constructive in form and purpose; it guides and informs more often than it commands, and it makes little use or display of penalties.[1]

Legal power has to be administered—applied to tasks. The power of the state tends in some cases to operate almost automatically by fixing penalties for infringements. In reality, though, all law has to be enforced or put into action by someone designated for the purpose. For some laws the officer may serve largely as a guard, to prevent abuse or to inspect for non-observance, as in a state railroad commission; but when the law provides for a service like education, the task of putting the law into action is much more complicated. School law is not a single act but a complex body of laws, covering all the many and varied tasks required to carry on the work of a school system. The larger the school system, the more kinds of tasks there will be and the more separate cases there will be of each kind; so, the larger the system, the more kinds of laws will be necessary to cover the different types of functions, and the more times each law will have to be applied to a case of each

[1] Carl J. Friedrich and Edward S. Mason (Eds.), *Public Policy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940. Chap. I. Also see Robert R. Hamilton and Paul R. Mort, *The Law and Public Education*. Chicago: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1941. Chap. I.

type. This bringing the law to bear upon work is administration.

2. *Two-way Application of the Division-of-labor Principle*

Fitting authority to tasks. Division of labor is the principle we apply in handling a large and complex undertaking. The application of this principle to the work to be done in a school system gives us the job assignments of the employees. To perform any one of these tasks, the employee must have the necessary legal authority to act.[2] The authority must be appropriate in kind and amount for the performance of the task, whether it be cleaning floors, giving instruction, making curriculums, selecting and employing teachers, making the budget, preparing reports, enforcing school attendance, administering first aid to an injured school child, or developing major school policies. By extending this division-of-labor principle, we get a classification and arrangement of tasks by virtue of which the work of the schools can be performed most effectively; that is, we get organization.

The principle upon which the organization, or division of labor, is worked out is to be found mainly in the nature of the tasks to be performed, but it is modified somewhat by the circumstances (physical, social, financial) under which performance has to be carried on, and partly by the nature of the authority required to perform the task in question. That is, the division-of-labor principle is applied both to authority and to the work, the former providing the vertical structure and the latter, the horizontal framework of the organization.[3]

[2] Luther H. Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization." In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York, Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

[3] John Lee, "The Pros and Cons of Functionalization." In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

Discretionary use of authority necessary. The law provides the right kinds and amounts of authority for the development and maintenance of schools. For the local district this authority is placed in the hands of the district school board to apply. In part, this law is specific in its definition of what the board may do, and to some extent sets forth how the board shall proceed. Partly because of our reliance upon the principle of local self-government, but largely because of the complex and changing nature of the task, the board is given wide discretionary powers, which hundreds of court decisions show it to be the purpose of the state that the board shall use. To a large extent, therefore, it is for the board to decide how it will arrange the jobs and how it will apportion the authority for their preformance.

3. *Difficulties of Applying the Division-of-labor Principle*

Authority must be used in a wide variety of work and by many employees. Since the most essential element in the authority used in school management is legal, our first concern here is with the task of distributing this legal power to officers and employees, all of whom have to use some portion of it in the performance of their tasks.[4] Legal authority is the same in nature, whether it is applied in policy making, by the board; in setting aside all board rules to meet a disaster, by the superintendent; in preparing the payroll, by the business manager; in assigning classrooms to pupils, by the principal; in conducting a recitation, by a teacher; or in moving a piano, by a custodian. In all cases, the authority is the state, being put into action by a person acting as the state's agent or employee. Authority is power to command,

[4] For a fuller consideration of the nature of the legal authority and of the social and personal forces that operate with it in school administration, see Chaps. 7 and 10; also Newton Edwards, "School Law—II. Court Decisions," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941; also Robert Hamilton and Paul R. Mort, *The Law and Public Education, with Cases.* Chicago: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1941.

and it can be applied in many ways, either to persons or to things. With us, the source of legal power is the people. The people set up the state with whatever powers they see fit, and they usually specify, also, some things that their state may not do. Here, our concern is with the power granted to the state's legislature to establish and maintain schools and to sublet them to school officers.

School authority limited by the nature and purposes of school work. An interesting principle that operates with the legislature, the school board, and the teacher, alike, is that they do not deplete their respective supplies of power by using what has been granted to them. Along with this principle must go a second one, that the legal power to maintain schools is specific, not general.[5] A school officer cannot apply state authority to any and all tasks, on any and all occasions. For tasks named or implied in the law he has power in whatever amount the work requires, but for uses not in or implied in the law he has no authority at all. It is the process of delegating or portioning out this kind of defined authority that we are here examining.

Keeping in mind that school authority comes to us attached to purposes and functions, not as authority but as authority *for,* it follows that delegations of authority can be effected only if one has first determined what work is to be done, what ends are to be served. Through a constitution, the state mandates and empowers its legislature to establish a school system. The legislature, in turn, creates school districts and delegates power to local school boards to perform this task for the individual districts. It was not just power, but power to establish schools, that was granted to the legislature by the constitution; so, it is not authority, but authority to develop and maintain schools that the legislature has to offer to the school district. In offering this, however, the legislature sets forth in an extended code of laws what it means by schools. Accordingly, the authority dele-

[5] This principle is well established in court decisions. See *Bohn v. Stubblefield,* 238 Ill. A453, as an illustration.

gated to a local school board is extensively restricted in terms of the kinds of work it is designed to carry out.

The work of education is itself very complex. Because of the nature of education and of the educative process, especially with respect to the factor of change resulting from social and scientific development—the instructional program must be fitted intimately to the needs of the community, and this in terms of the needs of the children individually—the legislature must inevitably allow freedom to school boards to design and conduct their programs to fit the local needs. The law says that the board shall do certain things, but in many cases it does not say when or how the board shall proceed. The board is ordered to provide for arithmetic, perhaps, but not told precisely what that subject is to include. By implication, therefore, it becomes the duty of the board to find out what are the educational needs of its district. This discretionary power is not any less clearly mandated for use than are the many strictly defined powers granted by the laws. Discretion is itself set to a task, but in this case the task has to be planned—one might say, discovered—before it can be performed. This means that school work is not all doing—doing things set out in the law—but also, planning things to do and devising ways of doing them.[6]

Planning is an aspect of nearly every part of school work and cannot easily be separated from performance. When research was first introduced into school work, some thirty years ago, it was set up as a separate unit. This was proper enough, but for the fact that the assumption quickly de-

[6] The proper use of discretion in government is a highly complex problem. Discretion as applied in our extended list of Federal tribunals may appear different from that applied by a school board in a local district school. Only by seeing it at work in its many places in our political system, however, can one hope to get an idea of the importance and the difficulties of using the principle. See William B. Munro, "Our Vanishing Government of Laws." *California Law Review,* 31:49–58, December, 1942. See other titles in Munro's bibliography. Also Marvin B. Rosenberry, "Law Versus Discretion in Government." *Tennessee Law Review,* 15:514–531, February, 1939. Also other titles listed in the bibliography of this book.

veloped that this new unit would do the studying and planning while others did the executing. Very soon it became apparent that the two functions were drifting apart, both being weakened by their separation. This was a wrong application of the division-of-labor principle. We made this same mistake, when we first introduced the function of guidance, by separating counseling from teaching. It is apparent, therefore, that the task of applying the division-of-labor principle to school work is a technical one—one that a lay board cannot wisely undertake without the aid of its experts.

Division of authority to fit tasks, simpler in theory than in practice. It is no less difficult to apply the principle in the realm of authority. School-survey experts have repeatedly come upon cases of very bad distribution of authority, cases in which staff members high in the school system were not at all sure of what their authority covered, and cases of employees plainly assuming authority that had not been allocated to them. They have found many cases of people who were trying to apply administrative authority in performing the function of supervision and endless numbers trying to settle matters by authority that could be settled aright only by application of knowledge. Even more common is the practice of delegating power for very specific tasks only, one by one, as needed, thus making a chore boy of an employee who should be a responsible executive in charge of a field of his own. Of late there has been demand for placing authority in a group or a committee[7] rather than in one person, in the belief that better decisions and more faithful execution of work would result. These illustrations may serve to suggest that applying the division of labor principle to authority is quite as technical as applying it to the school work.

[7] Comstock Glaser, "Managing Committee Work in a Large Organization." *Public Administration Review,* 1:249–256, Spring, 1941. Also H. O. Hilary, "The Position and Functions of Committees in Local Administration." *Public Administration,* 7:376–386, October, 1929.

4. *Questions Involved in the Delegation of Authority*[8]

Some powers can, others cannot, be delegated. At the outset, attention should be called to the established principle that a legislature cannot delegate its own power to legislate but can delegate power to administer a service that it has authority to provide. As a principle, this operates in the case of the school board. On the face of it, this seems clear enough but, in practice, the best legal talent is often in doubt about determining precisely whether an act is legislative or only ministerial. Illinois enacted a school law empowering school superintendents to effect changes in district boundaries. In court, this law was held to be a case of delegating power to legislate and so was declared invalid.[9] A local board could delegate to its superintendent the power to select teachers but not the power to contract for teaching service. It could have its superintendent prepare a statement of policy for the schools; but for the policy to be made effective, it would have to be enacted by the board.

The book of rules vs. case precedent as a method of delegating power. Because school laws are broad and general, it is commonly provided—or otherwise, it is implied—that a board may enact rules for the more detailed and specific regulation and direction of the schools. In this, the board is performing legislative, or what is commonly called sub-legislative, service. It is refining the statutes for use or interpreting them for specific application in the district.[10]

[8] See Francis G. Wilson, "The Prelude to Authority." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:12–27, February, 1937. Also Yves R. Simon, *Nature and Functions of Authority.* Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1940.

[9] See *People v. Lovellette,* 134 N. E. 317; 302 Ill. 210.

[10] The growth of administration in our government, Federal, state, and local, of all sorts, has brought the question of rule making by administrative authorities very much to the fore in the last three or four decades. See Ernst Freund, "Substitution of Rule for Discretion in Public Law." *The American Political Science Review,* 9:666–676, 1915. Also Leon Green, "The Administrative Process." *American*

In place of such formal legislation as this, boards sometimes operate without rules and try to maintain continuity of policy, purpose, program, procedures, and organization by the use of precedents. By reference to the minute book, a case similar to one in hand can usually be found, so, through the years a series of cases becomes established as a set of precedents and so, in effect, operates as a set of rules. Regardless of what plan a board may follow, it must inevitably perform this kind of legislative service if the schools are to operate harmoniously.

Problems faced in delegating authority in schools. It is through this sublegislation, this refinement of the school laws, this formulation of a book of rules and regulations, or the accumulating of this series of case precedents that a board handles the major part of its task of delegating powers and responsibilities to its officers and employees. It is in this task that a board faces the questions of what powers it has to delegate, how specific and detailed its delegations should be, what powers it should and should not delegate, to whom and for what purposes powers can most wisely be delegated, how delegated powers are to be related to responsibilities, and how it may determine whether delegated powers are being efficiently applied.

These problems seldom have to be faced all at one time, nor are these the only problems that arise. School systems grow and the control mechanism of a school system is almost, in some cases more, a matter of custom or tradition than a product of science or a question of legal authority. The positions of teacher, principal, superintendent, clerk, and custodian are old, old positions. This is very well, perhaps, for we would not try, even if we could, to run any institution without using the power and influence of social

---

Bar Association Journal, 21:708–712, 738, November, 1935. Also John M. Pfiffner, "Development of Administrative Regulations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 221:1–8, May, 1942.

proprieties, customs, conventions, and traditions.[11] But all these forces are born of the past, the distant past, and cannot alone be trusted to guide us. That is why we are concerned with scientific management, and this, even though our science is to be applied by men, themselves somewhat bound by custom and tradition. It is not any one case that concerns us here, however, but the entire problem of placing authority in a school system. The problems are the same, whether they are all faced in one legislative effort or in a thousand separate acts over a period of years. Principles are what we are in search of, principles to guide school officials in the task of distributing authority and responsibility.

5. *First Step in Delegating—an Analysis of the Work to Be Done*

Twofold nature of most tasks—planning and executing. Since delegation of power must mean power to act in the performance of specific functions, it is necessary, first, to determine what functions are to be served. Since learning is by individuals, since individuals differ greatly in their needs and capacities, since any individual varies in his ways of reacting to instruction from day to day, it follows that

[11] Through the work of many cultural anthropologists, to say nothing of the flood of advice from propagandists and would-be reformers, we have begun to take more account of these social forces as tangible matters in government. Through tradition, the past sometimes holds us and our institutions too fast for too long, but it also prevents us from running hither and yon after every idea that comes along. That is to say, we have social stability at the cost of having to watch to keep it attuned to oncoming change in the circumstances of life. John Dewey has reasoned quite clearly that our democratic government was not formed from "theories of the nature of the individual and his rights, of freedom and authority, progress and order, liberty and law, of the common good and a general will of democracy itself, did not produce the movement" of democracy, but only reflected it. *The Public and Its Problems.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1927, Chap. III, p. 85.

school machinery must be sensitive to change and variety and be on the alert if it is to bring the right educational influences to bear in the right way at the right time for the children. This means that the legal power must be applied with careful regard for this varied and changing task and not just "poured on." Each person in the staff must represent expertness in sizing up the need and in moving to action in some particular task. Clearly, such details of the work cannot be seen with any exactness in advance and, therefore, power to act must carry power to decide first what action is needed. So the power that is to be delegated to fit with functions to be performed will have to be specified in part and discretionary in part.

Delegation must take account of how functions are related to one another. As was noted above, there are two types of work to be done in a school system—planning, and doing.[12] The one we call a staff function, the other, a line function. The one operates mainly in terms of knowledge, while the other must, in addition, apply authority. Obviously, no line officer can do his work without knowledge, without study and thinking; and a staff officer must, at least, have the authority to do his own work, even though he cannot use his authority to command others. This seems to suggest a division of labor that might be useful in delegating authority if we could find a way to recognize the togetherness, as well as the separateness, of these two types of work in actual practice. Here, as in the case of discretionary authority, a sharp definition of the limits of authority is difficult to fix. It is not easy to assign to one person the power to do the research work of the school system, lest this office may tend to drain off all the study that properly goes with line functioning.

Functions commonly recognized in delegating authority. The analysis to which most attention has been given in

[12] Luther H. Gulick, "Research in Public Administration." *Public Administration* 9:388–392, October, 1931. Also: H. S. Person, (Ed.), *Scientific Management in American Industry*. *Bulletin* of the Taylor Society, VII, April, 1922.

school organization has to do with the kind of service, the type of authority required, and relations between types. It includes the following functions as separate types:

1. Legislation—making policies, deciding cases, contracting. Performed by the board, but with aid of the superintendent.
2. Administration—directing operations in terms of board policies and decisions. Performed by a hierarchy of executives, varying with size of the school system.
3. Supervision—a staff service devoted to development, coordination, and improvement of instruction. Performed by supervisors or by employees having some supervisory duties (assistant superintendents, deans of instruction, principals, curriculum directors, coordinators, directors of departments or special fields).
4. Teaching—instruction, care, and management of children. Performed by teachers, coaches, counselors, and supervisors.
5. Health care—instructional, inspectional, supervisory, diagnostic, and treatment services, covering health of pupils, sanitation of plant, cafeteria service, protection against epidemics. Performed by medical experts, nurses, physical-education directors, and coaches, in cooperation with teachers and principals.
6. Research—staff service—devoted to study of problems, preparation of data and reports for use in the system, evaluating, experimentation, and planning. Handled by specialists with staff powers only.
7. Library service—care, development, and operation of library service—title of librarian in common use for one in charge. Service, in part, line and, in part, staff in character.
8. Clerical and secretarial service for all divisions of systems as work requires.
9. Operation and maintenance—technical, trade, and common labor, covering development, care and operation of buildings, lawns, and gardens.
10. Business and accounting—to cover financial accounts

and budget control, purchase, storage, and distribution of materials and supplies. Performed by accountants and business experts.

This list could be further broken down and, in some systems, would be extended, perhaps; but in general it represents a functional classification of the jobs essential in running a school system. To perform administrative functions, authority is required for everything. That is the nature of that service. Administration is authority in action. Every move is an official act, decision, order, notice, plan, or command. The person in charge acts as an officer or functionary (having no power at all as a person), and whatever he does and all that he does is legal in nature and, so, final. What he does may have required extensive knowledge, got by research or, possibly, by way of inspection or of information from his secretary, but the decision he makes and the order he gives as a result are law execution.

Contrasting with administration is the function of research—that is, the pursuit of knowledge. Research, aside from the right to perform it, is not a legal activity and requires no authority to command others.[13] In research, it is knowledge and not authority that turns the wheels; and the product is a report of findings, not an order for others to follow. The findings of research have no legal power in them but only the power of fact and reasoning.[14] If research results are to move anyone to action, it must be by force of conviction; otherwise, they must be taken hold of by line functionaries and have legal authority put behind them.

This may illustrate very well how some school work is done mainly by use of authority and other mainly by use

[13] A modicum of administration is required to organize and direct the work of research; but in that, the use of power to command is very limited.

[14] John M. Pfiffner, *Research Methods in Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940.

of knowledge, but most units of school work are of a nature to require both authority and knowledge to perform them. Often, too, because of the nature of the work, authority has to be shared by several, in order to harmonize action where results depend upon the efforts of many different persons, as in fixing assignments of lessons when a student receives instruction in several classrooms and from several different instructors. This harmonizing can be effected in two ways: by arranging a hierarchy of powers or by placing power with groups, rather than with individuals. Business, industry, the army, and—to a large extent—government and the schools have found the hierarchic principle the better when success depends mainly upon certainty and speed of decision; and the latter principle, when success depends upon development of unity of purpose, common understanding, refined cooperation of effort and will, and when time allows room for study, deliberation, experiment, and revision of plans.

One needs but little acquaintance with school work to know that administration must work harmoniously as well as authoratively with all the other services, and that it must not clash with itself. Authority must be so placed that the hierarchy will function as a single unified mechanism. Administration sets all the services going and guides them. By wrong placement or application of authority, any service may be weakened. When a teacher *commands* a child to learn under penalty of failure, or when a supervisor *orders* a teacher to use a specified procedure, that is an exhibit of authority wrongly placed. Children and teachers can learn and perform under compulsion, no doubt, but usually such learning and performance are bad, either because they do not last, or because they are accompanied by other mental and emotional developments that are detrimental.

Instruction depends upon supervision, upon research, upon administration for special positive and distinctive contributions. It depends upon budgeting, accounting, purchasing, health inspecting, clerical and filing service, each

for a special kind of support. This interdependence of services is equally important for all the services and, as one considers the points of contact between the types, it is apparent that the relationship needs to be very intimate and detailed. Such contacts cannot be effected by authority alone, or by authority plus knowledge alone. With these, there must be a common will to serve.

Delegating authority for a school system is thus seen to be a highly complicated task. Since authority is useless and may be detrimental, if not appropriately attached to functions to be performed, its proper placement involves a careful consideration of what authority is needed for each of the many tasks in a school system. Some of these tasks can be defined in advance and some cannot, so, as was noted above, the delegating task involves placement of discretionary, as well as of defined, powers. Besides the large number and varied character of the tasks, there is the relation of one task to others, the interdependence of functions, that requires an interlocking and close harmonizing of all the powers for all the separate services. To add still further to the complication, it is apparent that authority is effective in such an enterprise only when it operates along with knowledge and with a common will or purpose. Some types of work require little authority and much use of knowledge and of will to cooperate, while others require more authority and less of knowledge and unity of action. When one adds to all this the point that authority is applied by persons and, so, is almost surely affected as to value for service by the person who applies it, and the further point that knowledge and will to serve are even more affected by personalities, it becomes clear that the task of delegating authority in terms of functions is one of difficulty.

6. *Second Step—Determining Type of Administration Desired*

How authority is to be used should be determined before it is granted to any employee. It is suggested above that,

to provide harmony of action in a large school system, it is necessary to arrange the units of service in the form of a hierarchy, so that unity of control may be assured. The term hierarchy has a forbidding sound—largely, because in the history of governments it has been so much associated with the military or with the abuses of monarchies or aristocracies. Emphasis was upon power to command and upon strict obedience and firm personal loyalty of those commanded. In a democracy, the hierarchic structure is equally important as a means of producing unity of action; but here unity is produced by authority that belongs to the governed and that almost certainly must be guided by knowledge. The hierarchy affords a system of channels for the flow of knowledge, as well as authority, and although authority flows downward only, knowledge can be made to flow equally well in all directions. Thus a democratic hierarchy differs from its military or autocratic prototype. It is not that autocrats cannot or do not use knowledge, but that too frequently they substitute personal wishes for what should be objective facts and sound reasoning.

A democracy makes much not only of knowledge, but also, of the ways of developing and utilizing knowledge along with authority. In a democracy, facts speak almost as forcefully as legal orders, and very often they can be used to force a change in orders. That is how respectable they are as a part of the actual directing power. In a democracy, point is made not of mere obedience to orders, but of informed and willed obedience. In fact, the term obedience is inappropriate in school government, for the response to an order is more correctly called cooperation when the subordinate has perhaps contributed the knowledge and the will that are, in reality, a part and parcel of the order given.

In an autocracy, power lies not only in an office but in a person. "I am the state" meant just that. Power was a personal possession, to be applied at will. Power, thus defined, changes the personality of its holder, inflates his ego,

and often misleads the possessor into the false notion that he can do things more easily by command than by learning how to do them. It is not necessary for autocracy to govern without knowledge, nor is this always its custom; but when personal wishes and a matter of truth and justice clash, the autocrat frequently defies the latter by applying his authority.

In a democracy, the authority is delegated to an office, not to a person; and the authority is authority of law or office, not of the person. This is as true of discretionary as of defined authority, the difference between the two being merely in degree of sharpness of the limits to which the officer is to judge and decide how to proceed. This kind of authority tends less to inflate the ego of its holder; indeed, properly conceived, it tends to make its holder humble, because it makes him responsible. It makes him responsible, first, because he is held by the law governing his office; second, by the provision for the constant flow of facts to be used or to be faced; third, by the necessity for his having informed cooperative service at all points in the system. Thus, democracy governs by use of authority, knowledge, and good will, through a united staff, an informed and purposeful team; autocracy governs by authority applied through personal command, with knowledge or without it, at will.

7. Third Step—Provision for Use and Flow of Knowledge

In administration, control is exercised and direction of the service is given, in part, by direct and, in part, by indirect use of authority—direct, in the form of established rules and decisions, indirect, through reference to facts to be assembled and interpreted. When a decision should depend upon facts, it is well for the law or the rule to establish that as the authorized procedure. For instance, a teacher's salary should not be left to the discretion of the superintendent, but should be determined by matching the facts of the teacher's training, experience, tenure in the system,

and success score against the specifications of a salary schedule. In such a plan, there can be almost no chance for rule by person, and because it is impersonal, it arouses no fear or suspicion of unfairness or favoritism. Such a mechanism, rational and human in its origin but automatic in its operation, helps to maintain morale, the sense of partnership, the will to cooperate. Other illustrations of facts, being made to determine how authority is to act are seen in the array of figures called the budget; in the system by which scholastic achievements are defined; in the system of financial and properties records and accounts; in the established norms and formulae used to determine class size, teaching load, seating capacity of rooms, retirement for employees, and the like.

The advantage of such use of facts is not only that it makes the procedure objective and, so, limits the possibility of any personal use of authority, but because, in making it impersonal, it also makes it fair to all and reasonable; it makes it possible for all to check and verify orders or decisions and provides a clear basis for registration of any justified criticism or protest. Such a basis has also the value that it provides both the element of certainty and the element of elasticity, together in one rule. Whoever reads the rule can see in advance how the action is to be determined and, when the facts are available, any interested person can find what the action is to be, before it is announced. With this kind of law, no one need be in doubt or be fearful or hesitant. At the same time, since the facts vary from case to case and with the passing of time, the effects of such changes are reflected in the decision and, so, tend to keep decisions and actions abreast of the times and in suitable adjustment to the needs of individual cases. Clearly, then, it should be the rule, as far as practicable, to delegate authority so that it operates through facts, rather than on the basis of personal opinion or preference.

This plan of making action dependent upon specified facts or formulae is but one way of using facts in a school

system. There is another way, of equal importance, *viz.*, that of setting up authorized channels for the constant flow of knowledge, corresponding to those for conveying authority. Orders go from superior to subordinate, and for their conveyance specific channels have to be provided. There is every reason why we should have equally clearly defined channels for the flow of knowledge. The lines that connect the units of a hierarchy of authority should serve this purpose, for the reason that those at the top of the hierarchy are greatly in need of knowledge that is available only at the bottom.

Since, traditionally, authority occupied the channels of the hierarchy most of the time, and since administration was largely personal and authoritarian, it became the custom for a subordinate to offer no information or advice to a superior except upon request. This is obviously bad; and for the removal of such an outworn viewpoint and tradition in practice, it is suggested that to every school employee authority and responsibility be clearly delegated as follows: each and every employee of the school system is hereby authorized and empowered and it shall be his duty, not only to assist in preparing information for use in school planning, but at all times to pass to any other employee such information as he may possess and believe to be of value to such other employee for a proper performance of the latter's duties. For the transference of such information, the official channels or lines of authority shall be used.

This type of authorization would provide for free speech in a slightly new way, perhaps, and allow facts to play a part in forcing responsibility upon those who have authority. It is not alone, or primarily, the effect of compulsion, however, but that of informing, that would constitute the benefit from such a concept of one's obligation and his freedom to utilize facts and to pass them on to others. Hierarchic paths should be made smoother by such two-way travel; and by more frequent meetings on those paths, purveyors of authority and purveyors of facts might be ex-

pected to become better acquainted, more friendly, and more effective for service. Gossip and telltale meddling could not get far, for they would have to match with facts from other sources.

8. Fourth Step—Clear Definition of Powers Delegated

It seems obvious that when services interlock, as they do in school management, there will be friction rather than coordination if, in the delegation of authority and responsibility, care is not exercised to provide a way for effecting these intimate contacts between services throughout the system. It is equally obvious that, if an employee's powers and duties are too minutely set out in his contract or in his assignment to a position, he will infer that he is to stay very strictly within the limits of his own position. Such an assignment seems to suggest that all lines that separate jobs are danger lines, to keep away from. In organizations of this type, sensitiveness and jealousy may very soon replace friendliness and the will to cooperate, whereupon the whole important idea of coordination of functions becomes impossible. The opposite extreme, of no clarity of assignment, opens the gates widely for abuses that lead finally to the same end. The lazy, the timid, and the indifferent stand back and, so, create a "no man's land"; the aggressive take possession and push on until friction results.

Somewhere between these extremes, depending much upon personalities, somewhat upon the traditions and prevailing attitudes, somewhat upon the nature of the coordination required in a given case, somewhat upon available means for supervision, and somewhat upon the means for checking and fixing responsibility, there must be a practical middle-ground solution. If a teacher is caught at the point of conflict between his supervisor and his principal, or if a pupil is neglected because his teacher dislikes the guidance director, no amount of authority alone, no amount of discretion alone will ever produce the refined harmony of effort needed. The solution effective for the prevention and for

the cure of such cases might have to be different. Surgery is sometimes the only answer to long neglect; but how not to neglect is the question here.

To date, school administration has not set itself very firmly to the task of building a clear-cut mechanism for the placement and flow either of authority or of knowledge in the system. Neither has it very definitely attacked the problem of coordination from the standpoint of developing staff morale, the will to serve with others in the system.[15] Both of these tasks need to be faced; however important authority may be, it has to be applied by persons, and it will be effective to its appropriate ends only if proper intelligence and proper will are applied in its use.

As an approach to the solution of these two tasks, the following suggestions are offered:

1. No school system of any size should attempt to operate without a book of rules and regulations to guide its board's actions and those of its employees.

2. Such a set of rules should interpret the law by showing its applications for use in the district in the following respects:

a. The major purpose of the service should be defined.

b. The program of service that is to be provided should be clearly indicated.

[15] In view of the work of the Acheson Committee and of the Hoover Committee, and of such studies as those of the American Bar Association and the attempt at case studies in the field, we can say that these problems are now very much alive and that headway is being made. For the Acheson Report see Sen. Doc. No. 8, 77th. Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941. For the Hoover study see *The Hoover Commission Report.* New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949. For report on case-study projects see William Anderson and John M. Gaus, *Research in Public Administration.* New York: Social Science Research Council, Committee on Public Administration, 1945. For work of the American Bar Association see reports of the association's committee on administrative law published in *American Bar Association Journal,* Vol. 29, 1943 and succeeding volumes.

c. The major structure for the placement and flow of authority should be established, mainly on a functional basis.

d. The freedom of flow and the continuous use of knowledge in the system should be provided for.

e. The major policies that are to govern the service in all its divisions should be stated.

f. Similar provisions should be made for the definition and control of plant, development of properties, business management, and board activities.

3. Positions should be clearly assigned, care being taken to relate the assignment to the objectives, organization, managerial procedures, and program, as outlined in the rules; and with special explanations when discretionary power is to be delegated or when close cooperation with others will be involved. This can best be done at the time of appointment. Such an explanation is not matter for a contract or even for a written notice of assignment. It is merely helpful information, of a presupervisory sort, that provides professional orientation to the employee.

4. Any rule or tradition or common practice that is not consistent with truth, justice, and scientific fact, or a well-formed public will, should be revised or abandoned.

5. Definite steps should be taken to build up the attitude that employees are trusted; that checkups are for the purpose of improving the system and not for catching culprits; and that primarily laws and rules are to direct and support, not to restrict and penalize.

6. Morale built in terms of common professional purposes and cooperative effort in behalf of the interests of the children and the community is indispensable; and this, regardless of how important it may be, also, for teachers to work together in terms of their own interests.

Chapter 9. THE NATURE AND PLACE OF POLICY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

This chapter is concerned with the practical task of school government through a system of policies. After brief note is taken of how the term policy is used and misused in practice, an attempt is made to find out what policy consists of, what form it may take, and how it may be developed as an instrument of government. Following this, the need for formal policies in small, as contrasted with large, districts is examined. Finally, the practical task of formulating a system of policies is analyzed and some guides to action are outlined.

Policies are not superforces from without, but must take form in terms of the needs for government. This need is invariably complex, because it requires the use of knowledge and careful respect for social forces, as well as law. Further, the law is brought to bear through persons and often involves wide use of discretion. Good government must provide for continuity and certainty, but also for elasticity. It is the function of policies to resolve this conflict. It does so by forming controls of law, science, and social elements applied together in terms of the nature of the service covered.

Two approaches to policy making, one by case precedent, the other by advanced enactment of rules, are examined and compared as means through which the board, the executives, the employees, all may contribute to the task, each in the light of his knowledge, his responsibilities and his

authority, the object being to show how the need for a policy can best be found and expressed.

The study of policy needs in large and small districts bring out many basic likenesses, but also important differences. Likenesses are in legal foundation, purposes, and types of functions required. Differences are in the nature and scope of any one task and the number of elements and relationships involved. Need for rules diminishes as the task becomes more simple.

As a guide, the general approach and plan for a book of rules and regulations is outlined.

1. The Realm of Administration

Viewpoints. At educational conferences one often hears the statement "this is my policy." In some cases, emphasis appears to be upon "this," in others, upon "my," or again upon "policy"—so that in the end the listener is left in confusion as to the nature and place of policy in school government and, even more, as to how policies are developed and used in government and as to the matters upon which a school system should have clearly formulated policies. Though a thick volume might be required to cover so large a field, this brief sketch is offered in the hope that partial analysis may be useful, if only it opens the subject well but avoids closing it. But first, what is the realm of administration?

Changing nature of school government. The government of our schools is a part of our total scheme of government. Education being a function of the state, and the district being a part of the state, we may think of the school administrative process as the state in operation in the matters of education. What goes on is an expression of the state. Back of the materials, personnel, and action, one sees that there is authority—a body of law. That, too, is an expression and also an instrument of the state. Since what one sees going on in a school system is consistent with that body of law, we sense how the state extends down into and deter-

mines local government, or better, how the state becomes local in its nature, or how the local unit is a part of the state.[1]

In our country, law is not static but is in a continuous process of growth, of forming and reforming, of expanding and retracting—as the people will have it.[2] The state is always in process of becoming. The forces that produce these changes are many. Public officials, yes; but also, public opinion, formed on the basis of knowledge, customs, conventions, social proprieties, habits, aspirations, and all the complex needs and circumstances of life that make up our culture.[3] Without this mechanism of social forces, we could hardly exist as a society. Law, the state, the formed society we know as our country is evidence of the working of this social network of controls, for laws are but the formalized implications of these commonly accepted ways of life for a set of rules to guide us in new or complicated situations in which habit and social proprieties, so far, have not found their way as guides.

Administration's place in school government. School

[1] Carl J. Friederich and Edward S. Mason, (Eds.), *Public Policy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940.

[2] This is true not only in the sense that we keep adding new laws, but also, in the sense that our interpretations change with social changes. See Benjamin N. Cardozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process*. New Haven; Yale University Press, 1921; and especially, his *The Growth of the Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924. Also Jerome Frank, *If Men Were Angels, Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942. Also Edwin Norman Carlan, *Legal Realism and Justice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Also Roscoe Pound, "The Future of Law." *The Yale Law Journal*, 47:1–13, November, 1937.

[3] Society is not merely a collection of individuals. To make up a society, the individuals must be bound together by some forces that enable and, in large degree, compel the individuals to live together through mutual trust and understanding, common tastes and desires. Our language, our moral code, our traditions, our manners, our tastes, our physical needs, all are a part of the cement that binds us together into a society.

administration is subject to, it expresses, it is supported by, and it operates in harmony with the law, on one side, and with custom and public opinion, on the other. Administration has an exclusive realm of its own, however, because state-wide laws cannot be formed to care for details, for tasks, the problems in performing which cannot be foreseen or vary greatly in nature, from district to district. Here discretion has to be relied upon. Within that realm, ways must be found to express the public will, which is born of the social life of the people and of the scientific and professional life and work of the school staff. Whatever administrative policy is, as a feature of government for the district it must find its place within this realm and in a proper relationship to the forces of law and of common social usage. In a sense the word policy refers to the instrument by which the meaning of the law, the current wishes of the people, and the requirements of science are brought to bear upon the service—in this case, the service of education.[4]

2. *Uses of the Word Policy*

Policy as a characteristic of the administrator. According to the dictionary, the word policy has a number of meanings, even when used in government. School administration has some use for two of the major meanings. By one of these, the word policy refers to the political or managerial wisdom, ingenuity, sagacity, or skill of the administrator. This sense indicates at one extreme, a statesman; at the other, a clever, wily trickster. The way of work for the

[4] M. E. Dimock, "Study of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:28–40, February, 1937. Also Charles Christie, "A Note on Administrative Principle." *Public Administration* 10:87–99, January, 1932. For a clear analysis of the process of policy making based upon an extensive study of practice in the field of business, see Melvin T. Copeland and Andrew R. Towl, *The Board of Directors and Business Management.* Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1947. Chap. II.

one is consistently honorable, wise, dignified, just, and reasonable; that for the other is sly, clever in misleading while feigning honesty, and without consistency. Here policy refers either to a personal characteristic of the administrator or to a quality of his character or personality; or it may reveal the method and style of his working, so long and so generally followed that it has come to be expected by all. In both cases, the policy is attached to the character of the man.

Policy as a principle of government. In a second use of the word, reference is made to the principle or theory that guides decision or action. Principle, here, is not to be confused with personal motive, nor is its object to guide personal thought and conduct alone. It does not attach to the person of the administrator, but to the system of government. It is outside and impersonal; it controls the administrator's conduct as it does that of others. Policy as a principle of government may be in the form of a purpose to be attained, as, it is the state's policy to make education available to all; it may be in the form of a guiding theory or principle, as the curriculum shall be designed in terms of the educational needs of the children, of the cultural purposes of the community, and of the political requirements of the state and nation; it may be in the form of a system of measures marking out the procedure, as, salaries shall take account of age, experience, training, and tenure and shall be determined by use of the accompanying formula. This procedure embodies and expresses the policy which, in general terms, is to have salaries controlled by equitable and objective methods.

Policy in these ways is seen to be a characteristic or a definition, either of personal character or conduct, on the one hand, or of the process or mechanism of government, on the other. In both, policy stands for some kind of order —for stability, continuity, and consistency of purpose and action over a period of time—and it projects into the future as a control. It is easy to see that, if policies are very min-

ute and specific, it may be difficult to harmonize them or they may so crystallize action as to become a hindrance to progress. Just where policy ends and concrete devices for applying policy begin, it might at times be difficult to define; but this is because we confuse a principle of action with the management of a specific case of action.

Use of the term here. Omitting this confusion, however, if the term is to be useful in a technical discussion of the nature of administration, a distinction is necessary as to which meaning is referred to. Also, when we think of policy as the basis upon which action is to be taken in a wide field or in a wide variety of cases, through a long period of time, we shall need to think of policy as requiring many special rules or devices or routines to make it effective in practice. The special devices may often need to be quite temporary, as special circumstances change; but policy runs deeper; policy is rooted in the philosophy of the state, or, we may say, it reaches up out of it, and out of the evolving cultural substance of society, and out of the science of education, to hold the school true to the more basic concepts that guide our way of life as a people and as a nation.[5]

We have many types of policies in government and we use special qualifying adjectives by which we distinguish one type from another. We speak of policies as being stable. By this we mean more than that they represent continuity. We usually mean that they are sound, trustworthy because they are genuine expressions of our broader political and social philosophy and consistent with educational science. When we speak of policies as vacillating, we mean that they shift their meaning and, so, lack consistency. Often we say weak and vacillating, meaning that they are not soundly formed or that they are not well ad-

[5] If the reader does not find precisely this use of the word policy in Aristotle or Shakespeare or Carlyle or Adam Smith or Woodrow Wilson, then he is invited to examine this idea for practical use in a study of the school administrative process.

ministered.[6] We speak of policy as wise or as just when we want to commend it for far-sightedness or for its fairness or special appropriateness. When we speak of policy as shrewd, we usually refer to the person who formed or who interpreted and applied it. Such reference may be intended to commend it for its sagacity or its ingenious application or to condemn it for its trickery. We may refer to a policy as one of expediency.[7] This may mean that the administrator relies upon his own ingenuity to meet situations as they arise; it may mean that the factors with reference to which action has to be taken are so much in the hands of others—competitors, enemies, perhaps, whose actions are not to be depended upon—that a permanent policy cannot be formed for fear the opposition may take unfair advantage of it; it may mean that at the present stage of knowledge the basis for any other policy cannot be reached; it may mean, too, that the administrator is slow, incompetent, self-seeking, or dissembling, and that he wishes to be free to bargain or, sometimes, perhaps, to bludgeon.

Of these two groups of meanings—the one referring to the administrator, the other to the government—the more useful for school government would seem to be that referring to the basic principles to be followed, that is, to the *system of measures* by which decision and action are guided. That which refers to a quality of the administrator's personality

[6] It is hardly possible for a policy to vacillate, since any change would end it and establish another policy in its place. By vacillation we mean either the dodging of an honest recognition of the policy or an excessively clumsy application of it by which one retains a pretense of applying it but cripples its effectiveness by bad timing or other abuse.

[7] A policy of expediency is, in a sense, a policy of avoiding the use of policy in government. It is, at best, a negative force, a means of dodging. If government cannot produce a positive principle of action, perhaps it may be justified in taking a defensive position. This might be justified on occasion in international affairs, but in local self-government it can hardly be regarded as strong government.

or to the character of his work in formulating or in applying policy is undoubtedly worthy of the wide place it holds in the literature of many centuries and there is some occasion for its use in school administration. The effort that is everywhere being made to reduce administration to the semblance of a science is, however, trying to put its work upon a more objective plane and so to make it less subject to any personal liking or whim. To do this there is great need for the study of government as a system, as something positive and outside the reaches of personal interests—something to which personal interests are subject. This does not mean that administration is not to involve discretionary use of authority, but rather that discretion shall be soundly based and, so, less whimsical. Administration has to have discretionary power in order to do its work.[8] That means that personal interest will have a chance to motivate action, unless we provide some control, such as a policy, a principle, or a set of measures with reference to which the work has to be done. At the same time, we have to recognize that discretion is there to be used and that it is discretion that provides opportunity for the use of inventiveness and skill in management. As long as administration involves man-to-man relationships, it cannot be all science and no art. In these personal contacts, complicated problems, economic, educational and organizational, are involved and there is wide room for use of originality, for exceptionally active imaginations and exceptionally ingenious minds and gifted personalities.

3. *The Nature of Administrative Policy*

The need for policies in administration. To understand the nature of policy in administration, one must go beyond a bare definition to a study of its origin, its behavior, and its effects. From what need does policy arise? What form

[8] Jesse B. Sears, "Administrative Discretion vs. (or with) Rules and Regulations." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 29:257–283, May, 1943.

does it take? What functions does it perform? In a study of these matters, account has to be taken of the nature and purposes of public education as the service in which policy may be needed and in which it is to be developed and used.

The need for policy is found in the need for order, stability, continuity, clear purpose, and the sense of security and permanence in the conduct of the schools. Biologically, it has been necessary for man to foresee and prepare for situations. In proportion as he has been able to do this, he has survived or, perhaps, lived more happily. Otherwise, he has been destroyed or has lived in fear or in some measure of discomfort. It seems natural, therefore, that in government, also, man should crave and strive for permanence of order. Such permanence, when it has been achieved by a policy or a law and is too long held to, may become a danger, because the world in which the permanence was achieved is a changing world.[9]

Conflict between need for permanency and need for elasticity in policies. This reveals two elements of need for policy. We want and have to have some continuity of order and, at the same time, we have to have elasticity of order to meet changing conditions of the life and work in respect to which the order functions. It reveals, also, a characteristic of policy, *viz.*, that it has to do with the future—it is to provide for anticipated needs ahead, so that when a problem arises there is a solution ready to meet it. It is the knowledge of having the solution ready that gives one

[9] First, we were shocked by the Darwinians, who told us that all plant and animal forms had evolved from simpler forms, different from those presently known, and that this process was still going strong. Then came the flood of light upon the changing character of the social world. Now we are struggling for a philosophy of life that recognizes the unavoidable fact of change and the equally unavoidable need for permanence and stability. The idea of change we accept, but from it we demand progress. The idea of stability we accept, but from it we demand that it shall not mean stagnation. In government, to find the proper balance, we may do much by legislation, but the judiciary and administration must also play major roles.

the sense of security and that makes for mutual confidence among men, for permanence in government.

One can scarcely realize how far-reaching this need for a sense of order and of permanence is until he considers the kinds of future oncoming situations he has to be ready for. The motive is not fear of danger alone, but also fear of failure. Further, the need is positive, as well as negative; corresponding to fear there is the purpose, the will, to achieve. Ambition to achieve is as real a drive as is fear. Success stimulates effort. Man needs to feel that his work is moving effectively toward its goals. To produce this feeling in education, the work must go forward with due regard for the intent of the law, the methods and findings of science, and the feelings and will of the people, all in harmony. This can be accomplished only by planning for it and by carrying on with consistency of purpose, plan, and method; all of which may be provided for through having an over-all policy with reference to which plans and actions are shaped.[10]

Management of the schools is not carried on in isolation. Management is but an extension of the process of lawmaking. The school administrator is in charge of, and is responsible for, a unit of public service, which service, to be effective, must reflect the interests and mores of the community, must operate in terms of the economy of the country, and must be based in a substantial way upon the sciences of psychology, biology, health, sanitation, sociology, and economics. Clearly, the foundations of administration must be derived from these same sources. Accordingly, policy making will take account, not only of the law, but also, of the prevailing culture pattern and of what the accumulated knowledge of education requires—all in the light of existing circumstances. In science we use such words as law, theory, hypothesis, postulate, assumption, premise, conclusion, in order to follow where fact and truth lead. Policy in local

[10] Ralph S. Fuchs, "Concepts and Policies in Anglo-American Administrative Law Theory." *Yale Law Journal,* 47:538–576, February, 1938.

school administration should effect an extension or interpretation of the laws of science, thereby establishing a scientific, as well as a legal, order as a feature of the mechanism of school government. Policy should never try to set the conclusions of science aside, nor should it ignore the customs and traditions of the people. It must respect and extend these, just as it respects and extends the constitution and statutes.[11] Further, it should do this in positive form. It is not enough to avoid being unscientific, or to avoid breaking the law, or to refrain from scoffing at public opinion.

Thus it is that good school service demands that we apply the findings of science, the intent of the law, and the wishes of the public as far and as fully and as appropriately as we can.[12] In school government, the need for protection against fear, fear of abuses of authority, is important; yet, it is in reality but half the need. The first need is for a good service in which the rules of science and of law and of public opinion are harmonized and aggressively applied in producing good schools.

How the authority of law, of science, and of our way of life may combine in policy. If we are to have policies that control by force of law, of science, and of the public will, in combination, it will be because we put the authority of law back of the facts and logic of science, and back of the tradi-

[11] When we see how social change can alter such fundamental instruments of government as the constitution, we realize that the concept of change has to have a place in our philosophy of life in society. See Charles G. Haines, "Effects of the Growth of Administrative Law upon Traditional Anglo-American Legal Theories and Practices." *The American Political Science Review,* 26:875–894, October, 1932. In a later paper, a little different phase of this question is equally well illuminated by the same author. See his "The Adaptation of Administrative Law and Procedure to Constitutional Theories and Principles." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1–30, February, 1940.

[12] Herbert B. Mulford, "School Policies as an Aid to Public Relations." *The American School Board Journal,* 103:15, 16, August, 1941.

tions, aspirations, and current wishes of the people. Science can tell us what to do but cannot enforce its findings. Public opinion can indicate the people's desires but, at best, it can enforce them only by the slow and indirect methods of public voting or other legal procedure. That is, it is within the nature of the law to compel; of science, to inform; and of public opinion, to advise—at a future time, perhaps, when it has access to legal means of expression to enforce its will. When one votes, however, he applies legal force, as well as his own knowledge and will. So it is the nature of only one of these three forms of authority to enforce its own will against opposition.

We may well examine this point further, however, for although this may be true of the nature of these three kinds of authority if they are in court, yet, closer examination of their actual behavior in the affairs of management will show that this statement has to be qualified. First, laws—in our country, at least—rarely or never exist in defiance of science. More often they are in support of science. In fact, in a court of law, science would often be called in to indicate the exact meaning of the statute. Also, judges not infrequently determine the meaning of a statute by applying the meanings of terms current at the time the law was enacted, or by ascertaining what meaning was accepted and used by the public at the time of the law's adoption. Law is expressed in words, and words have meanings that are gained partly from usage and partly from science. In this sense, legal authority is by the nature of its own origin related to the authority of science and to the authority of social usage, and is not separate from or antagonistic to them.

There is yet another consideration. It is true that men are moved to act or to decide by the dictates of law. But most of the time, choice of decision or of a mode of action in administration is not a question of law; rather, it is a question of choice of educational or social values (philosophy), or of the selection and interpretation of facts (science), or of

interpreting and adjusting to public opinion (feelings, understandings, and will of the people). Few administrators fail because they defy the law; not many, because they misuse it; more often, they fail because they ignore the authority of fact and logic or the authority of public opinion and social usage. Knowledge, in its way, and tradition and social aspiration, in their ways, are as often and as completely compelling in their places in management as is legal authority in its place.

4. Giving Form to a Policy

Form not unlike that of statute. In its form, a policy is not specially different from a statute. A statute may embody a number of state policies. A policy is a rule, in the sense that it specifies something to be done or accepted, or that it may set limits to ways of doing the thing. It may be in the form of a declaration or of a set of limitations or of a set of meanings to be observed. It can be written, though it may exist without being formally set out in words, mainly by virtue of common acceptance through long usage or precedent, as is the case with the common law. Here, however, as in many other places, it is to be remembered that the written word is less likely to have its meaning change without notice.

How formal policies function in management. What policy accomplishes, how it functions in administration, is perhaps the most important index to its nature and meaning. Written policies are a means of informing the school staff and the public of what the board of education is trying to accomplish and what it expects of its executives and other employees. Information, in this sense, is a basic element in school government. With the school staff, policy facilitates action throughout the system; it rationalizes administration; it affords a basis for common understanding, which, in turn, provides a foundation for staff morale; and it provides a basis for intelligent planning of the details of daily work.

With the public it affords a basis for understanding and for judging the schools and is the soundest possible foundation for proper public relationships.

Policy does more than inform, however; it also compels, by establishing bases for action. Administrative directions must follow the board's policies. Board policies are reflected in organization throughout the system and, likewise, in planning, in control, and in coordination. That is, policies are law and, so, they govern. They govern not only the school staff; they also govern purposes, programs, housing, procedures, records, equipment, supplies. One can govern well in a school system only if he is authoritatively informed and properly empowered and guided. It is the function of policy to so inform, empower, and guide.

The only alternative to such formal control would be government largely by man, rather than by law. To this kind of government democracy must have limits.[13] Since statute law cannot operate in the realm of the many details essential in the management of a local school system, we seek to refine and extend the statute law through policies specially designed. On the negative side, policies function importantly also. They do this by preventing would-be intruders from using the schools and by keeping down wasteful trial-and-error procedures.

5. *The Development of Administrative Policies*

The nature of a policy. Summed up, the above analysis provides the idea that policy, as here defined, is to have the force and effect of law, that it is an extension and refinement of statute law, and that it is consistent, also, with the authority of science and with the traditions and the opinions and wishes of the people. It is established, also, that policy must grow with educational development, and that, as a governing principle or set of measures, policy is often applied through minor specific rules or devices of control.

[13] Henry Wolf Bikle, "Administrative Discretion." *George Washington Law Review,* 2:1–12, November, 1933.

Third, it is indicated that policy is our practical answer to a need for a sense of security through continuity and permanence of order; to our need for a means of common understanding as a basis for cooperation and compromise; to our need for a means of expressing our purposes and will to achieve our educational goals; to our need for preventing too much personal rule and too much meddling and haphazard experimenting; and to our need for proper public relationships. Finally, it is suggested that policies may be used as instruments or means for performing any or all of the five types of administrative service. The only danger suggested as possible from a use of policies in administration is that of delaying or thwarting needed change or progress by virtue of too great permanence of policies—seemingly, a small detraction to balance against so great a worth.

Case precedent approach to policy making. As policies do not appear by magic when they are needed, the question of how to develop them becomes important.[14] Policies may be formed in advance or may be constructed by slow accretion, from experience. By the former plan, a policy would be set up as a rule or regulation embodying a principle or a set of measures to guide action. By the latter, it would take the form of an actual board enactment, which the board might use as a general pattern for later decisions. We speak of the latter as a precedent. A case used as a precedent might be very narrow and specific, in itself, but action upon it might be so taken as to reflect the application of a

[14] The problem here is one of legislation. The purpose is to show what it takes to construct school policies. It may be regarded as an omission to have overlooked so fully the pressures that enter, to disturb the working of right forces. Politics of various sorts does affect school legislation at times; but, if educators work up to the standards suggested by this analysis of the problem, then politics will not find it easy to change the course of operations. In state and Federal affairs of government, one can see how legislation is affected by political forces. See Edward P. Herring, *Public Administration and the Public Interest.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1936. Part V, especially Chap. XXI.

broad principle, a principle that the board might, if it chose, embody in a rule defining its policy on the types of questions involved. Such a case would not actually state the board's policy, as such, but it would show that the board had decided to apply to one case, at least, a principle in a comprehensive way. In a later case, if the board compared and decided that, because of similarity, the present case should have like treatment with the former one, then the former one thereby would have been given the status of being a precedent. Thus, precedents can be built up through time into governing instruments having much the same function and effect as formally enacted policies, without being formally declared as such.

Formal book of rules approach to policy making. Whether to try to develop a set of policies—a book of rules and regulations—in advance, or to accumulate case precedents may be, in part, a question of one's preference, but not wholly so. By now we surely know enough about policy making for schools to settle a great many problems in advance and, so, to avoid many of the errors and delays incident to piecemeal management. When one checks an item of business against a formal policy, he is checking against a relatively unchanging base; whereas, in checking against a former case, one is more likely to be diverted from the underlying principle by the special peculiarities of the case. In short, it is harder to rule soundly by case precedents than by formally stated policies.

There are likely to be instances, however, of new kinds of business, for the handling of which the most thorough set of rules will contain no guiding policy. In such cases, policy making may have to await the accumulation of experience before the proper principles of action can be found. Also, time may bring changes that tend to alter the value of long-used policies. This does not argue for no formal policies, but only for constant study of policies in the light of experience with cases, if we wish to keep our policies alive. Without rejecting the use of case precedents, what follows will

refer to policy as a formally adopted rule or instrument of government.

Where policies can be used in school government. If through policy we can provide for any or all kinds of administrative service, it would seem that policies might be used anywhere in the school system and for governing any kind of work. To test this idea out, one might consider how a policy might be used in the various types of work and in the various parts of a school system.

It would be easy to see that salaries could best be administered by use of some formally established policy—a guiding principle or a set of measures upon which the detailed instrument of a salary schedule would rest. It would be obvious that a policy on the use of public borrowing to finance building would be useful in promoting public confidence. Policy regarding eligibility for employment—matters of age, training, experience, marital status, local residence, relation to other employees—would be useful. Equally obvious is the practical value of policies regarding size of class, the daily work schedule of a teacher, the employment and control of custodial service, the scope of the school health program, the use of district transportation facilities, the powers and duties of officers, the types and extent of educational programs, the nature and place of library service.

When one prepares and adopts plans for curriculums, he is establishing educational purposes. Thus, where the function of policies as instruments for governing, in the sense of controlling the personnel, leaves off and the function of guiding and harmonizing the professional efforts of the personnel begins, is not clear. Neither is it clear where policy to guide action separates from policy to establish educational purposes. These policies must all be in harmony, since the controls effected by any one policy have obvious implications for the objects of others. From this sampling, then, it would seem that wherever one looks in a school system he finds a need for policy to provide for the orderly extension,

application, or interpretation of law, science, and social will, in the conduct of schools.

The school board in policy making. The laws empower and command the board to establish schools, and they provide general specifications for this; but they leave to the board wide freedom in its task. The law does not empower the board to do the school work, but only to determine what the schools shall do, who shall be chosen to do it, what moneys may be expended, etc. The board's business is to authorize, not to operate. It estimates and inspects, and it judges what shall be done and the worth of what has been done. Beyond this it does not go. A board has its own lay knowledge and the intelligence of its members to work with. On questions for which these are inadequate it must go to its technically trained employees. If policy is to be an instrument by which the board gives power, direction, and form to the schools; and by which it establishes laws, effects coordination, and fixes controls over activities; and by which its staff runs the schools, then the board is very certain to be faced with many technical matters for the handling of which it will, of necessity, turn to its experts.

To operate a school system requires that purposes or objectives be set up; that a program be planned; that personnel and materials be provided; that the personnel be organized, directed, coordinated, and controlled in terms of purposes and program; that housing and facilities be selected, shaped, and operated to fit the needs of the service; that records and reports be prepared; and that the instruction and care of children shall be the starting point for all these matters. The formulating of purposes, curriculum making, teaching, health, safety and care of pupils, supervising, research, inspection, administration, accounting, clerical and innumerable kinds of trade and common-labor activities—all these are used in running a school system. To put each of these activities in its proper niche, to keep them working harmoniously together, requires knowledge, imagination, and skill; it also requires planning; and finally, it requires au-

thority. Such a task cannot be simple. In other words, there is almost no board problem that does not in some manner involve questions that are technical in nature. Accordingly, if policies are to be provided as a means of bringing the statutes to bear upon the actual processes of managing, then many of those policies will have to be prepared by technically trained persons.

Policy as an extension of the personalities of technical employees. If one looks at the school activities from the standpoint of the board's chief executive, or from that of a minor executive, or from that of a supervisor or a teacher or a clerk, it will be apparent that to maintain harmony of effort throughout the system there must be some means by which each employee can know how to adjust his own efforts to those of others. That is, the function of policy in school government is not merely a police function; policy is not a mere device by which the board keeps its staff under control. Policy is also a working guide for those who operate the schools.

Policy is born of the service in which it functions. This examination of where and to what ends policy may be useful in school government strongly suggests that policy cannot be something brought in from the outside, ready made to be imposed upon the schools; rather, it appears to be something extracted from the schools, formed of the stuff of experience gained by study, planning, and managing. This is true even of the instructional objectives. The element of authority in policy is effective not so much by force of the legal penalty that it can bring to bear, as by force of the understanding, the conviction, and the purpose that it expresses and conveys to others. Having been formed largely by those who are to apply and who are themselves to be guided by it, it is, in fact, their own policy; and its power is largely in their own intimate understanding of it and in their sense of ownership or parenthood of it. Since it embodies and expresses their ideas and their will and ambition, it must follow naturally that they will apply and defend it. Thus,

policy rules and guides, not by penalties, but because it is in fact an extension of the knowledge, the will, and the personalities of those who enforce it.

Since policy arises out of need for order and understanding in the schools; since, by the nature of the schools' needs, policy can be formed only by those who are trained for it, by those who understand the needs and whose understanding exists not only by virtue of their training but also by the fact that it is they who must meet the needs, that is, apply the policies in their work; and since the power of policy to control and to guide is born quite largely in the making of the policy itself, it would seem to follow that policies cannot properly be formulated by those in positions of legal authority alone, but must include, also, the efforts of those who represent the authority of knowledge and those who will bear responsibility for their application.

Some practical difficulties in policy making. This inference appears unavoidable if we use policy for things other than policing, as we obviously do in school administration. But to apply this conclusion as a principle is not easy. The work of a school system is so much a unit, each part is so related to all other parts, that almost everyone in the system must have some interest in almost every policy that is formed. Since the adoption of a policy often involves acceptance of implied values, of purposes, of objectives, of activities, and often of choice of methods and procedures, in all of which there is sure to be wide difference of opinion among those who participate, it would be hard to get agreement that would guarantee full loyalty to the policy. Then, to have all participate in the making of all policies is too distracting and too expensive in time and energy. So, to be practically useful, participation must be effected through some compromise between the obviously too much and the obviously too little.

Participation may be by individuals, or through groups. It may be through direct work, through advice to or criticism of the work of others, or through passing judgment by

way of voting to enact, revise, or reject the proposal. Direct work can be of many sorts—casual suggestions, orderly consulting, research, the organizing of materials, reporting, etc. —and responsibility can be of almost any degree. What seems essential is (1) that those properly concerned shall have a right and an opportunity to contribute;[15] and (2) that, when one possesses knowledge and skill for a task, he shall be under special obligation to make them available if requested. This would assume that policies would be formed by those most capable and those most concerned and responsible.

Approaches to task must vary. In the development of policies, we are not often in a position to start *de novo* to build a complete system of management for a school district. Most school systems are already old and long established; and where they lack in the formal mechanism of the school government, they usually have traditional practices to guide action. As the task commonly arises, therefore, policy making is a piecemeal undertaking, designed to provide in advance for some expansion of the school work, or to remedy a difficulty that can no longer be left to care for itself. To this there is an increasingly frequent exception or near exception, as when the system undertakes a complete revision of its plan of school regulations.

Policy making as planning. Whether one approaches the task of policy making as a whole for the entire school system or as that of developing a single item of policy for a limited purpose, and whether he approaches the task as a plan for some expected future need or as the correction of a defect in the present management, his general approach should be the same, *viz.*, that he is working for a plan of govern-

[15] By one's "rights," here, reference is not to any legal authority but to the nature of the position he is in, by virtue of the knowledge he has of the problem in question, and by virtue of the implications a policy would have for his own duties and responsibilities. Certain rights, professional rather than legal, are inherent in the dignity and the responsibility of one's position.

ment that will be unified and harmonious in all its purposes and parts for the system as a whole, that the policy must be consistent with law, with the science and philosophy of education, and with the attitude and will and cultural purposes of the people, and that in establishing such an order he must be as mindful of the need for change and progress as for that of stability and permanence. The need for any particular policy is not a thing apart, a separate phenomenon, for the need of any part of a unified system is a need of the whole of that system; so any single item of policy must be designed as a part and not only as a separate whole.

First step, to establish need for policy. One approaches the task of policy making through the techniques of planning, if the aim is to anticipate a future need, or through the techniques of diagnosis, if it be to remedy a current defect in management. In the former, one tries to foresee the need; in the latter, the need is evident in the defects found; but in both, the first step is to establish and understand the need for policy. Need for a policy is need for a means (in addition to the statutes) of attaining an educational goal. That goal may have been generally set out in the school law or it may be a commonly accepted but unwritten purpose of the schools. In any case, one cannot start to develop a policy without first deciding upon the end to be served by it. There will be general and specific ends—the former, broadly philosophical, political, social, and educational and the latter, having to do with establishing suitable means for attaining the former—because a policy covering compensation for teaching will aim not only to guarantee equity and justice to employees, but also to induce people of needed talent to enter and remain in the board's employ, so that good instruction may be a reasonable expectancy. Thus, in setting up the need for a policy, one must go quite beyond the surface pressures of the immediate situation to the further implications it may have for the major educational purposes it is to serve.

The importance of this step cannot be too much insisted

upon. When a breakdown is the starting point for making a policy, as often is the case, the annoyance may be so much in mind that the search is, above all else, for a cure of that ill; whereas, the purpose of a policy should be for broader application, cure of any special ill being but an incidental consequence of a broader provision that is positive and constructive and far-reaching. Similarly, in planning for anticipated needs, there is always the danger that the needs may not be examined at great enough length for what may be distant or transferred effects of the provision in question. Since a policy is a rule by which a broad principle or plan or set of measures is applied to a whole class of cases, it is apparent that policy may affect the activities of large numbers of people by altering their purposes, their procedures, the standards they apply in their work, their working relationships to others, what they may have as working facilities, and the like.

To illustrate what is meant by the need for a policy, take the question of the organization of schools in almost any growing city. In a young city or in the growing edges of an old community, new schools seem to appear in answer to the demand of almost any local neighborhood club and, often, on demand of promoters of new real-estate projects. Soon it becomes apparent that the placement of schools is very uneconomical and out of line with the arrangements for flow of traffic and with the development of industry and business interests and consequent shifts of the population. Often, parts of buildings or even whole buildings are left empty of children, while others are overcrowded within a few years. The financial loss may be considerable; but in many cases, the upsetting of the instructional programs, though less tangible, may represent an even greater loss—all because the board had had no policy or plan to guide plant expansion.

If in such a case one asks, what sort of policy is needed, the answer might be found by setting down the ends to be served. First, we should want a complete and rich educational program for all children; second, suitable housing for

the schools, properly accessible to all; third, sound economy in housing and operation. One might restate these three points in form and use them as guiding principles with reference to which the building program would be developed and kept revised and projected, a few years ahead of actual construction.

Lack of space forbids setting out here all the implications of these three propositions. A building inevitably dictates the school program in endless ways. Small schools make it next to impossible to have library, auditorium, shop, studio, gymnasium, cafeteria, and many other special services. Schools can be made very difficult and expensive by failing to anticipate growth or decline or shifts in the population, or by ignoring probable movements of factories or business expansion or the development of through traffic lanes. In short, it pays economically, educationally, and in social convenience to the people, to have the housing of schools under control of some basic concepts of what makes for sound education and sound economy and management. If school buildings served merely as corrals or as shelters, it would matter less; but the school building is a major instrument in management and a major determiner of the character of the instructional program and process. That is why the building should be designed in terms of the program, instead of having the reverse take place.

Second step, to formulate policy. With the need for a policy thus developed, the next step is to formulate the policy. If the need is for a clear placement of authority or for a definition of rights and duties, then control will be the end sought, the object being to govern people. If the need is for a plan of action, a program, a set of routines or procedures, the object will be to govern, but with emphasis upon telling what steps to take. Information and guidance, not compulsion, is the chief aim. The essential substance of the former is authority and of the latter, knowledge. When the need is for a policy to improve the public relations of the schools, a third type of emphasis might be called for,

in which the wishes of the public, born of tradition as well as of present pressures and hopes, will be mingled with authority and knowledge as the raw materials, the aim being to effect a placement and flow of authority and to provide for information and guidance that will restore the confidence of the public in the schools.

Having the need in mind and the raw materials essential to its satisfaction, consideration can turn to the working of the policy. Need for a policy often goes unnoticed. In practice, one is so often confronted with specific items of pressing business that many administrators lack experience in thinking in terms of the entire school system and of the broad principles and the long periods of time that lie back of large areas of school business. The pressure and the detail of practical work in school administration seem better suited for training short-term than long-term operators, clerks and mechanics than statesmen. Our better administrators are aware of this pressure upon them and of the futility of piecemeal action, and they try hard to guard against these conditions. In proportion as one must spend energy and time in dodging missiles, he will have less to spend on attack. But as skirmishes usually fit into battles and battles into campaigns, so the many items of business can be fitted into larger wholes. To formulate a policy, one needs first, therefore, to see the larger whole within which the case that provoked the study is but a single item.

To get this perspective, five separate approaches suggest themselves:

1. In what area or areas does the need lie—staff, program, housing, equipment, finance, records and reports, children's instruction and care, public relations?

2. What is the nature of the need—economic, educational, broadly social, personnel, managerial?

3. To what function or activity does it apply—administration, supervision, instruction, guidance, research, clerical, custodial?

4. Within what aspect of the administrative process will satisfaction of this need fall—organization, planning, direction, control, coordination?

5. Of what raw materials may the policy be made—authority, responsibility, knowledge, public opinion and attitude, law?

These approaches are but five separate ways of looking at the task in hand. No one—not even any three—of them provides the complete and comprehensive approach that is required in policy making. The first one indicates who of the personnel or what of the materiel are to be involved. In most cases, a policy will affect both personnel and materiel or parts of both. The second indicates the nature of the need and, so, the nature of the principle required in the policy. The third locates it in terms of the function most directly affected. The fourth shows what phase of the administrative process is most involved. Very often, all five aspects may be involved. The fifth asks by force of what kind of power the policy will be made effective. In any case, a careful inspection of the task, such as this suggests, will greatly clarify the purpose and the emphasis needed.

With these five analyses of the need accomplished, it is reasonably certain that a guiding principle or a set of measures can be worded that will represent full perspective—educational, economic, social, legal, and managerial. With such a draft in hand, a careful tryout should be made, preliminary to adoption. This should include a search of the board's minutes for cases that might come under the policy, and careful study should be made of the draft by representatives of those best informed and most responsible for its use. In the light of the results of these studies, the final draft of the policy may be prepared for official action of the board.

6. *Similarities and Differences in Needs of Large and Small Districts*

Does size of task affect the administrative principle required in performance? To assert that the need for formally

stated policies is the same in districts, regardless of size, does not seem convincing in view of the wide differences between the schools of a large city and those of a small village. The similarities may be genuine enough but not of a nature to require similarity of management policies; and the same may be said of the differences. Policies are formed as a means of establishing purposes, plans, and programs and of guiding and controlling materiel, personnel, and processes. The development, organization, and directing of a large staff might require far more work and be far more complex, and yet require use of the same guiding principles that would be required in the case of a staff of one-tenth or one-fiftieth the size.

The end to be served by a system of formal policies is not merely one of logic and theory, but a very practical one. To harness a village school board with an extensive set of formal rules might easily do more harm than good. A layman may approach the solution of a practical, concrete school problem with confidence and understanding, when to approach it through a complicated book of rules might be confusing or, to some, even frustrating. This matter of the bearing of district size upon need for policies calls for examination here, not as a practical consideration alone but because practical considerations in management often become compelling forces. Accordingly, a study of this type of question may conceivably throw some light upon the nature and place of policy in management.

Similarities and differences in legal foundations. Similarities of districts, regardless of size, are to be found in the political and legal foundations upon which all districts of a state are based. These foundations dictate the purposes, the programs, the processes, and the plans of support—all in general terms, but terms that fix many important limitations and compulsions. Other similarities are to be found in the fact that the processes of education in all places alike are based upon the science and philosophy of education. The laws of learning and of teaching are derived from a study of human nature, and the rules of management have to respect

those laws. With equal force we may say that management utilizes and is dependent upon the prevailing social mechanism—language, system of economy, customs, proprieties, ethical standards—the same in large districts as in small districts.

These common roots of the school as an institution are the bases for fundamental similarities of the schools and of the problems with which management has to deal. By their origin and nature, large and small schools alike must teach citizenship; they must teach the structure and the processes of our culture; they must teach the tools and rudiments of knowledge. All schools have to be housed, and housing is as much a question of instruction and of management as it is of shelter. All school systems alike have to locate building sites; to make and administer budgets; to devise courses and curriculums; to carry on instruction, research, and personnel services; and all have to develop, organize, and direct staffs. This analysis could go further into detail, but in these basic resemblances there is ample evidence not only that large and small districts have like problems but that they must use basically similar principles in solving them, too.

Internal similarities and differences. Differences within the schools themselves, as well as between large and small districts, are equally obvious. Some of these, also, are deep-rooted and are significant for school management. The impingement of the local government upon the schools within a great city is intricate, extensive, and far-reaching; though for a rural or village system the village or county government is usually remote or almost nonexistent in its effects upon the schools.[16] Social life in the city is complex, varied, and rich in possibilities for education along some

[16] City building codes, health and safety ordinances, traffic controls, police, courts, and often an actual interlocking of school and municipal governments, set many controls that affect the school administration in the city. The county government differs from state to state in its contact with rural schools, yet, with only a few exceptions, its contacts with the local schools do not correspond even remotely to what is common in cities.

lines, but very unlike the far simpler social life of the rural community.

These differences are reflected in the educational needs of the children and, so, in their educational programs and management. School buildings in cities are large in comparison with those of small districts, and the difference is reflected in the form and complexity of school organization and in the daily routine of life in the school. The city-school budget, with the business, contracts, records, accounting, and legal problems related to it, contrasts sharply with the budget in the small school system. In the city district, children usually have little contact with the occupation that supports their homes. In the rural school, every child is a responsible partner in the home occupation. In the city, children come from families representing large numbers of widely varied occupations and often from homes widely varied in social and economic status. These conditions contrast sharply with those which are typical in small districts. Such complexity of school population creates more problems for management.

The nature of the task, as well as the principle, is involved. One could extend such arrays of similarities and differences. These are typical, however, and may serve here as a fair basis upon which to consider the question of whether formally prepared policies are equally useful in the government of large and small school systems.

To what does a policy attach in management? Are the points of likeness noted above of a nature to demand that we have policies touching these matters? Are the differences noted of a nature to require such wide differences in management that a principle suited to govern in one would not be suitable in the other? With these two questions there is a third one—do small districts need formally adopted policies at all?

If the object of policy is good government; if a school board's acts are in response to statutory mandates to decide matters not set out in statutes, but clearly required, to pro-

vide schools; if the matters upon which similarity exists are matters about which such board interpretations, decisions, and actions have to be taken, then the question is, do the principles that apply in one case apply in the other, as well?

To make this concrete, take the similarities and differences in a school staff. Both the large city district and the small rural district have to employ teachers. The city requires a very large staff; the small district, a very small one. In both cases, there is need for trained people, for healthy people, for people of character and industry and leadership. In both, compensation is required and pay will have to be based upon what the desired types of teachers could get elsewhere or in other occupations. Compensation will need to be attractive enough in amount and the position will have to be attractive enough in its opportunities and its demands to keep teachers from leaving. Attractiveness is in respect to money; to working conditions; to prospect of promotion; to social opportunities; to special rewards in the form of assured tenure, sick benefits, sabbatical leaves, retirement allowances, and professional opportunities in the system. The fact that the city requires a wider range of specialists, that the city teachers will have narrower and more specialized assignments, that city teachers all have larger social and perhaps better professional chances, may make a city position more attractive; but it does not dispose of the above similarities of need for a plan of government that assures employees on the points in question.

If a board employs only one teacher, however, it may not need to worry about one matter that is of importance to a city board, *viz.*, having a salary schedule that is equitable for all teachers alike. Yet the small-district board will face the question of keeping its salary in line with all the other matters mentioned. It is assurance, guarantee, certainty that teachers want on these matters. The principles needed are quite largely principles of economics and, though they may be ignored as formal government orders by a board, they are never ignored by teachers, and it takes two to make

a contract. Without policies, stated in board rules or as board enactments or otherwise in the teacher's contract, the position offered to a teacher will have a corresponding lack of attractiveness for the kind of talent needed.[17]

It would be possible to develop a similar illustration on almost any major school problem and in connection with any major feature of the school system. The case used here throws light upon the questions raised above. Many of the points of similarity are such as to require action of a governmental nature. The absence of a board rule or policy simply means the absence of any such formally established offer or assurance to the employee; offers not thus set out in the form of policies on the above-mentioned items lack just that much in their power to attract and hold the talent needed.[18] Second, the principles that apply to these matters in a large system apply also in a small one. If the rural school board has less of social and professional attractiveness to offer, it will lose its good teacher to the city unless it offers something else to fill that gap.

The final point—whether the rural board needs to have a formally enacted policy to govern compensation—is not answered by the illustration. It is apparent that there are a number of matters to be taken into account here and that each of these items plays a part in determining the actual worth of the board's offer to a teacher. Certainty of tenure is a real value that has economic effect in bargaining for a

[17] Space forbids a full analysis of the problem of governing all the matters of compensation. A more adequate analysis of the way the various factors are involved and may be dealt with in the formulation of the salary schedule may be found in the author's *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938. On the question of the effect that the various factors mentioned here may have upon attractiveness of position offered, the writer has found but one study, a doctor's dissertation by David L. Greene, Stanford University, California, 1940.

[18] This lack can be supplied only if it is dealt with formally in a contract or a written assignment by which the contract is made specific.

teacher. A salary schedule with a high initial pay but not so many annual increments may attract, but it will not hold so well, those who come. A schedule of low initial pay, but with long-continued annual increases, though it may not attract so well, will tend to hold a staff and also to stimulate self-improvement. If a board employing only a few teachers can keep all these considerations in mind and will apply them, having them set out in print would help little. Such a board clearly needs to use the principles, though it might have less need of a formal schedule. Even this, however, may bear closer examination.

Two ways of dealing with this problem. There are two levels of procedure in administration. By one, action is taken in the light of practical circumstances and present facts and considerations only. By the other, action is taken in the light of basic principles that underlie the problem in hand; and the deeper one goes for these principles, the broader and firmer will be the base upon which decisions and actions will rest. If, by the former, one gives thought to all facts and conditions that may properly influence the case, it would seem to be sound enough. Operating on this level carries with it some danger, even though it may claim merit, in that one hears so often the assertion that such management is practical and realistic. There is danger, first, that the decision may be made in terms of a wrong purpose or a wrong balancing of values. It is easy for one to be pressured into altering his own judgment of values, to the end that action may be taken in terms of an easy and comfortable way out, rather than in terms of educational needs and values in the case. No school board is certain proof against this.

Too many administrators who take pride in being practical are, in reality, offering alibis for their ignorance of sound management or for their laziness and indifference or for their love of personal power and fear of local pressures. The right reason for a given job assignment is that the one chosen is the best choice now available at what can be paid,

and not that that person has the backing of powerful interests somewhere—in the staff, in the board, in the local clubs—or, worse yet, if possible, that that person is in urgent need of the promotion involved or has the best intentions in the world. It is true that wrong facts often get in one's way, that an administrator is at times forced to accept wrong purposes. The answer to this is that administrators are paid to fight for the rights of the schools. When they have fought fairly and hard, let them see that the decision is made in the open and that the records are complete and accurate. Then they can say, with self-respect, this is the best our plan of government could produce in this case; for the time being, this is our best decision—wrong educationally, but right governmentally.[19]

Another danger in operating by the case-to-case method and on the level of the practical circumstances alone is that it is so easy to go by general impressions and to move before all the facts and facets of the case are examined. The extreme of this is seen in actions taken before the people most concerned know that decision is impending, and in decisions made by secret agreement and announced very casually at a later time, when the people concerned are otherwise occupied. When there are written rules, such shamming can be largely prevented or in some measure penalized, at least. In other words, published policies are the best guarantee that action will always be taken on the level of principles. As long as policies are not established (in writing or in common acceptance and understanding), we face the hazards of management in terms of shifting—sometimes shifty—circumstance.

The smaller a problem is, other things being equal, the more likely it is that administration will take account of all the proper facts and forces. The small district has small problems, partly by virtue of its size, but also because of the fact that, in most states, the school law classifies districts

[19] Compromise is a sound principle, in democratic government, only if it is soundly arrived at.

and provides for small districts many checks that do not apply to larger districts. Some of these are statutory but frequently added controls are provided through regulations established by state office, by county superintendent, and by district-school meeting.[20] The small district also has fewer problems for these same reasons. This means less work and simpler work and, so, more time for study and deliberation in the small district. In large districts, the board has far more help of experts, but it also has a wider realm of discretion and a correspondingly larger number of decisions to make.

Whether the narrower realm of work, the simpler problems, and the larger time for deliberation in the small district assure administration from the deeper level is a question that must vary with districts, with the extent to which boards rely upon their teachers for help, and with the contribution made to the local board by the county office. To assume that the average lay board in any district, large or small, will act wisely upon questions that should be decided in terms of educational theory is assuming too much. It is also too much to assume that such boards, by themselves, could devise sound sets of policies. That the state office or the county office might provide a suitable handbook of policies, with instructions on their use, to serve the local boards, seems entirely feasible.

Answer to the problem. The answer to our question, then, seems to be that small, as well as large, districts need the guidance of written policies, simply because that is the only way to guarantee sound management. Circumstances are too uncertain, practical affairs are too unstable, and too many men are too little informed to trust all to chance. The smaller the district, the simpler and fewer the rules, perhaps; but there appears to be no way to guarantee right purpose and sound, orderly, and consistent management,

[20] Jesse B. Sears, "The District Meeting in School Government." *The American School Board Journal,* July, August, and September issues, 1945.

except by some extension of the law through policies, rules, and formal measures that are rooted deep in the science and philosophy of education. Because of the nature of the cases, rule by man is, relatively, as inadequate and as hazardous in small as in large districts. The fact that problems of management are simple and few in small districts is offset by the fact that boards and executives in small districts usually are less experienced. In all districts alike, boards and individuals are subject to the same kinds of pressures—pressures often unrelated to and even antagonistic to the purposes of education. The people in a democracy have never shown capacity for a very extensive use of the principle of rule by man except when that rule is restricted by clearly established principles or specific measures to guide and control it. The mere right to elect is not enough.

7. A General Over-all Policy for All Schools

Bases for a general over-all policy. The question as to what policies one might devise to meet the common needs of all school systems alike must be approached with the idea that likenesses among districts are accompanied by differences—differences such as those noted above—and that these differences cannot be ignored. Neither, in the light of the differences, can it be assumed that identical statements of policies for all districts would be possible. The fact of common need for policies implies only that there are matters common in all districts upon which policies are needed. The specific detail of these policies would be influenced—sometimes markedly, no doubt—by the differences among the systems. Our search, therefore, is for the common need and then for part, aspect, purpose, or process of the school system to which the need attaches and to govern which a principle of action, a policy, is needed.

In view of the common origin of our schools in the state, we may say that their purposes must be not merely to serve the state, but, better, to serve the same purposes as

are served by the state. The idea is that our schools are not mere tools for the state to use at will, but rather, that the schools are themselves the state,[21] or a part of it, and, as such, are responsible for the educational service authorized by the state. This neither frees the schools to work in opposition to the state nor requires them to accept from the state orders that are inconsistent with the social and political philosophy upon which state and school and all other divisions of our government rest. Further, our concept of democracy is not inconsistent with the methods or the findings of science. Democracy requires that the schools search for and teach the truth, and it can itself be realized only if they do so. This gives to our schools not responsibility alone, but also independence within the basic framework.

This responsibility and independence are limited to the function of education; but to interpret, direct, and control their application to schools is a large task. To recognize science, they must be applied in a manner consistent with the laws of learning and teaching, with the laws of child growth and development, and with the cultural pattern of the time. Because this task is so complicated, it should be of help to have a plan, a regulation of some sort, that would explain what the task means in terms of the situation actually faced by those who manage the schools. How to approach the task in its main aspects, in the light of its main purposes, is an urgent problem. To meet this, some broad, general, over-all policy is needed.

The administration policies are concrete instruments used to determine action on matters pertaining to the establishment and operation of the schools. One can determine action—action of board, executives, employees, or the public —(1) by fixing the purposes with reference to which action is to be taken; (2) by establishing definitions and limitations

[21] In law, the schools are referred to as an "instrument" of the state. Proper conception of the nature of the state and of the nature of education as a function of the state is believed to provide a basis for the soundness of the interpretation here proposed.

to the program of the service to be carried on; (3) by establishing controls with reference to which the necessary personnel is to be developed, maintained, organized and directed; (4) by providing interpretations and restrictions within which housing and equipment shall be developed and operated; (5) by establishing rules to govern finance and business; (6) by establishing directions for maintaining public relations; and (7) by establishing principles and routines to govern the operation of the schools. Thus purpose, program, personnel, housing, finance, public relations, and school government—the essential aspects of all school systems and the major centers about which need for direction and control exists in all systems alike—may be used as the points about which all may wisely build their guiding policies.

Some other analysis might serve equally well, but the similarities of school systems in respect to their needs for a sound, constructive, consistent interpretation of educational science and philosophy and of superior laws bearing upon these seven matters seem obvious, and surely their need for safe-guarding action against too wide a use of discretion in dealing with them is equally clear.

Policy to establish purposes or objectives. Control over purpose is important, since, in a large way, such control would cover also the means and manner of attaining it. Besides, direction in terms of purpose assures unity of understanding and effort, and these are the foundation of both economy of effort and sound morale. Purpose here has reference to the major, over-all purposes of the school system as a whole. Once these are fixed in principle, all lesser purposes tend to follow, as implications. These major purposes set limitations within which programs must be developed, personnel chosen, housing and finance provided, and public relations maintained.

Purposes suitable to be fixed in the form of policies in a school system may look in several directions. Purpose with respect to the ends for which schools are to be maintained—

who and what interests are to be served and what the nature and scope of the program will be; purpose with respect to the relation of education to our political and social philosophies—the general goals or objectives of the program; purpose with respect to the implications of the science of education for the instructional process and for the conduct of the schools; purpose as to the nature and use of authority in the school government—all three can be expressed briefly. To illustrate this: It is the purpose of the board of education that the schools shall be developed and maintained to establish the legitimate educational needs of all who are eligible to receive instruction and the corresponding needs of the community, state, and nation; that educational needs shall be defined in terms of law, of facts about the children, of public wishes, and of sound reasoning; that, in program and management, the schools shall everywhere recognize the implications of social change and the need for social progress, and in all respects shall practice and exemplify the principles and aims of democracy; that in the government of the schools authority shall be clearly assigned and everywhere used in the light of pertinent facts and of a full knowledge of the principles herein set forth and with special emphasis upon the application of the principle of unity among parts and functions within the system.[22]

It is true that these provisions are very broad and general. When one tries to take the next step in setting up or in operating any feature of the school system, he quickly discovers that these declarations have established a point of departure and fixed certain goals and limitations that hold him fast.

These purposes are not a set of don'ts. Rather, they are a set of positive specifications. The program *must* be as long and as broad as is possible under the law; the program *must* be as varied as to courses and curriculums as are the district's needs and the capacities of the children; the pro-

[22] The substance of this has been adopted as a preamble to the administrative code in the local school-board regulations of San Francisco.

gram *must* give serious thought to instruction in citizenship and to the contact of the schools with community life and with government; instructional and management processes *must* be guided by the dictates of science; the program *must* be a growing one and be kept in adjustment with social change. The plan of organization *must* be kept adjusted to its changing program; and authority cannot be used as if it were the personal possession of a chosen few, but *must* recognize the dictates of truth and reason.

It may be argued that these concepts would operate without being formally expressed and officially enacted as policy, because, not only do all school persons accept them as their own views, but all have been trained with reference to their implications for the school services. First, these latter statements are only partly true, or, if the reasons given are correct, then the answer would be that, if these principles operate without being formulated, at the worst, formulating them and adopting them as policy would not hinder their effectiveness.

It is safe to assert, however, that, regardless of beliefs and of training, in actual practice they do not operate automatically in anything like all cases, and that they do not stand up at all well under stresses. The reason for this is not far to seek. It is not the prick of conscience at sacrifice of a general principle, but the more concrete and direct fear of loss of personal advantage of some sort that causes one to decide or act wrongly in his position in management. Also, one refrains from such wrong action less from fear of offending others' sense of right than from fear that others may call him to account. With no established rule to break, there can be no breach of law for which an offender can be called to account; but with the idea of government through an official rule in force, the situation is reversed.

8. *Common Centers about Which a System of Policies May Be Constructed for All School Systems Alike*

General principles of preamble as basis for system of policies. The merits of policies cannot be judged by one

statement alone. It is not the assumption of this study of policy making that any single general statement could be adequate by itself, but rather, that in one such general rule the more basic concepts may be laid down as a foundation for a complete system of policies. From such a general preamble, the system would begin to branch to the major divisions of the service, each branch growing more specific in its bearing as its subdivisions increased in numbers and reached out toward the peripheries of the realm of school authority and school service. These broad principles thus become the foundation for a superstructure of more specific policies, the roots of a spreading tree of authority.

This connection of roots with stem and branches of a policy system can also be illustrated. To carry out the figure, let it be assumed that these basic concepts give life to and determine the nature of the system, as the roots of a tree bring life to branch and leaf above. The stem may symbolize the unity of the basic concepts and suggest that in all that is above there must be found the qualities of each of these concepts. Assuming separate major branches reaching outward and upward from the stem to provide the necessary life blood to each of the several parts—instruction, program, staff, housing, finance, business, public relations, and government—as the major subdivisions of the system, it would follow that any policy for any one major division would reflect the implications of all these major concepts.

Bases for more specific policies. Since policy is to be provided only if there is need for it, what is there about each of these major features of a school system that requires protection by means of such formal regulations, and what are the implications of our basic concepts for such special controls? Instruction is the major concern of schools. All else is secondary, because other things are but means to the real end, which is instruction. But what is instruction? It is a process, but a very complicated one. If instruction is achieved by direct classroom teaching alone, as too many assume, that is one thing; but if it is achieved, also, through

seeing and living in beautiful buildings and appropriately decorated rooms, and walking about in well-kept gardens, through participation in a well-ordered routine of life and work, through using the standards and techniques of our cultivated mechanism of social proprieties, through a broad and orderly program of social activities, through a system of student self-government, through an interlocking of school activities with community life, then buildings, grounds, furnishings, administrative routine, social activities, school manners, as well as teachers and books and discipline, become involved as elements in the instruction process.

By such a concept, administration is as directly responsible for a part in instruction as it is for the service of management. That is, the end of management is not order and economy alone; it is also demonstration and instruction. So, to turn this about, teachers are employed to teach, but in order to teach, one must have objectives—broad, general objectives and immediate specific aims; one must have something to teach—a medium or means for attaining his aims; he must have facilities and suitable surroundings and appropriate methods, shelter, equipment, and a social regimen. The act of teaching is both very technical and very personal. The teacher is expertly trained in that process, and no one can know as well as he the particular facilities and conditions that are required to make the teaching effective.

Thus it becomes apparent that the teacher has and should contribute expert knowledge to the development of the building, to the choice of equipment and supplies, to the organization of the staff and the program, and to the daily routine of management as these affect the children and classroom and playground and pupil activities. That is, the functions of teaching and administration are not separate and apart and independent, but are so closely interlocked that each is a direct contributor to the other. To these two, all the other types of services may be added. Supervision, research, secretarial, clerical, and custodial work are

specialized types of service; but in their natures and their contributions they, also, are parts, as well as wholes. Therefore, however separate the major branches of our tree may seem, they are not independent when viewed from the standpoint of the processes by which they are developed or those by which they are used to make the schools effective.

Holding to the principle of unity. The unity, symbolized by the stem of our policy tree, and representing a composite of our basic root concepts of school government, is thus seen to have a counterpart in the unity of elements which, in the nature of things, must exist among the separate parts and functions of the school system. In its origin and nature, teaching is inseparable from administration; and each of these, in turn, is related to supervision and to each of the other functions. Similarly, housing is related to program, to personnel, to finance, and so on. Whatever rules or policies we may require for the management of the several parts and functions of the system—of school business or plant or personnel or program, of teaching or supervision or research or administration—they must inevitably express this same nature and, so, must represent a complete harmony of purpose and provide for unity of effort and a spirit of responsible cooperation throughout. Thus, no rule stands alone; each rule is interlocked with others, to the end that the whole system of policies is, in effect, greater than the sum of its parts.

The mention of this concept of unity in the above proposed preamble statement of policy is not enough. The nature and implications of this concept are not only not widely enough applied in present practice, they are not well understood. An hour's visit in any school system will be likely to reveal examples of guidance operating apart from instruction; of supervision carried on apart from and often with little regard for actual educational needs; of administration operating as if it were more a power than an intelligence, and quite apart from and above what it directs.

This is reason for the proposition that, when a board

authorizes a service and establishes a staff or the housing and equipment for it, it should at that time enact a policy to define the nature and purposes of that service. In this policy there would often need to be a definition of working relations between the newly authorized and other existing services. If the nature and purposes of instruction, of supervision, of guidance, of research, of administration, of the business service, of custodial work, of secretarial and clerical work, of health and safety service, of cafeteria service, of housing, and of public-relations work, each were clearly interpreted in a manner comparable with the above interpretation of instruction, it seems reasonable to believe that the services would be more intelligently and more effectively unified than is commonly the case in practice.

Let no service be authorized by a board, no personnel employed, no materials purchased, no programs or procedures or routines instituted, except there be a definite purpose to be served by them; let that purpose, along with the nature of the material or service, be defined in a manner to establish clear responsibility for the service and for the proper relation of it to other services. This should be the motto, and though it might take one or two rules only in one school system and a dozen or forty in another, depending upon size, yet, on all these matters, a governing policy is a need in all school systems alike. If we know what we are doing things for, we should be able to state what we want done. If we know that these services should be unified and know how to unify them, we should be able to define procedures that would effect such unity. If we employ people to be responsible for service, it is reasonable to set out the definition of that responsibility as a basis of our contract; and what better substance than this could one use as the substance of school government?

Policy that delimits the various services. From policies covering the nature and purpose of services and materials we move logically to a definition of these services themselves. It is not enough merely to establish a meaning and

a purpose for instruction or research. It is equally important to set out in clear terms what these functions are to include. What is the program of instruction, of supervision, of guidance, of health work, of research, of social activities, of school-community activities, to include? Whatever the schools undertake to do, either as ends or as means of achieving ends, there ought to be a clear-cut definition of what the service or activity is to include. If a new department or activity is to be set up, it should be possible to define what this is to be and to become. The number, length, content, and types of instructional programs; the scope and amount of supervisory aid; the areas to be covered by research; the scope and plan of the business service—wherever one turns in a school system, there is work going on and it is a major function of government to define what that work is to include.

Unification through organization. One can hardly separate the definition of the programs of service from a third essential element and object in government, *viz.*, organization. Organization applies to parts of the system, as well as to the whole. A program of service is not very clearly defined until one has shown how it is organized. Management has to think of work to be done partly in terms of an arrangement of the work for doing; and before one can go far in authorizing work to be done, he must have in mind a plan for doing it; otherwise, how would one decide how many or what kind of persons to employ and how to house, equip, and budget for the service?

That programming and organizing must go on together should not blind one to the nature of either of these functions. The service being end, and organization being means, it is clear that organization is secondary, that it is dominated by the nature, purpose, and extent of the service and, in some measure, perhaps, by unchangeable external circumstances, such as limited finance, available housing, equipment, and staff.

It is not uncommon in school systems to find a lack of

clarity in organization.[23] This often comes from rapid growth of the system, but not infrequently from employing people before working out the plan of the service to which they are to be assigned. If the program of guidance is not clearly set up, it is quite easy for teacher and counselor to clash over the division of rights and duties. More than one school principal has worked under the handicap of not knowing to which desk in the central office to go with certain items of business. When an administrator settles questions that rightfully should have been worked out by the staff of teachers, he is ignoring sound principles of division of labor. Clearly, these lines of cleavage should be established governmentally in all school systems.

Staff policies. A fourth major area for policies is that having to do with the school staff. The school program and organization come, finally, to be personal questions with each employee. Teamwork can result only if each member knows precisely his own assignment and how, in actual performance, it is to interlock with the work of others. To assign without knowing the full requirements of the job is next to impossible in a technical calling. Only by knowing the demands of the job can one choose the right kind of employees. Once the right persons are found, they must be attracted to the available positions; once they are in those positions, if they do well, they must be attracted to stay in them. In an enterprise as changing as education, continuous study is necessary, so that some plan for this is needed.

Thus, to make certain that the schools will be well manned, there must be reasonable certainty on all matters pertaining to eligibility, selection, assignment, work program and conditions, transfer, promotion, compensation, tenure, leaves, retirement, resignation, dismissal, growth in service, and bases for judging efficiency. Clear plans and definite assurances upon these matters are so much a part of organiza-

[23] A study of school survey reports reveals this very clearly. See the author's *Organization of Sacramento's School System.* Sacramento: Board of Education, 1940.

tion that it is difficult to think of either without the other. These are all important subjects for policies in all school systems. They should not be left to chance or to spur-of-the-moment decisions, but should be clearly fixed in the system of government, so that they form a basis for every contract and for all services.

Policies affecting business and properties. As for finance, housing, and business, the situation is different in some respects while it is the same in others. It is true that law goes far toward safeguarding the order and sense of security that are needed in these areas. To some extent, too, school laws add much here beyond the protection afforded by the laws governing personal and property rights. Yet, to compel boards to be orderly in the laying of taxes; in the budgeting, spending, and accounting for funds; in the construction and operation of buildings; and in the granting of contracts does not provide all the needed certainty about these matters. The laws do not fully guarantee that properties shall be purchased and operated in a manner to fit the requirements of the educational service, rather than in terms of what they cost alone. Although economy is wanted in schools, it is not economy of cost alone, but economy in the cost of the special things needed. The chief end of private business is profit; of public business, service. Both try to get what they want at a reasonable cost, but what is reasonable when the end is profits or saving in expense may not be reasonable when the end is service. Properties purchased with a view to the contribution they may make to the training and care of children would often not be the ones purchased if the object were the kind of economy used in private business.

School business must be business for schools, precisely as bank business is business for banks. The over-all policy here should establish school business, in this position, as a means and not as an end, and as in all particulars subject to the controls of education. This affects the nature and purposes of the school business service; it affects organization—the plan for a division of labor with its placement and flow of

authority; it affects the choice, care, development, and operation of properties; and it bears upon the many questions affecting the personnel.

Although a general statement would serve to establish the basic principle, subordinating business to education in matters of authority and of values, yet in large systems this principle would need to be specifically interpreted and applied at many points to govern requisitioning, purchasing, storing, inventorying, accounting, budgeting, plant development, plant operation and maintenance, contracts, financial reporting, and the use of school properties for other than school purposes. It is in evidence constantly. In the practice as well as in the theory of school business administration, one sees the need for a careful and complete and concrete application of this general concept in the form of specific measures at all points where education needs to determine choice, decision, or procedure in the management of school properties and business.

Policies affecting procedures. Finally, there is the matter of procedures. Procedures are so related to authority and to purposes, organization, program, staff, and materiel that they are in part provided for by policies covering these matters. Organization locates authority, but so much of the authority needed has to be discretionary that the plan of organization does not and cannot easily provide fully for the routing of school business. When an employee is assigned to a job, he is thereby made responsible for certain work but is allowed and expected to use his own methods of doing the work. It is characteristic of every school job, however, that its duties are closely related to those of other jobs, and one aspect of every assignment has to do both with keeping its work clearly delimited and with keeping it coordinated with the work being done by others. Action in one office or at one point in the system must be taken with respect to actions being taken elsewhere in the system.

Policies covering the major procedures would do two things. They would provide a time control and a control

over method, guaranteeing that all would move harmoniously in these respects. In these policies more is involved than the mere principle of coordination. There is a management issue, to be sure, but the development of these coordinations must begin with the needs of the services involved and be so built up that coordination results. Coordination is, in a sense, an end but, in attaining it, one cannot ignore the needs of the service, which must be regarded as the greater end. School calendars must first take account of instructional problems, then of holiday dates, the weather, the vacation habits and work life of parents, etc. Procedures covering budget control must not prevent purchases being made in terms of classroom needs, merely to assure that no budget item shall be overspent.

Procedures may be defined in terms of a time for action, a place for action, a sequence of steps, amounts of things to be used and a description of steps to be taken. The description may be in terms of the items of business to be handled and the form or method to be followed. The principle of management to be applied most often in policies affecting procedures may be called coordination, but the order and sense of security sought by such policies involves the establishing of a common understanding of the work and of how, when, and where it is to be done, and the fixing of controls covering the work. That is, in these policies, government is effected not without the authority of law, but mainly through the authority of knowledge or common understanding and agreement.

Policies in this field may take the form of calendars, such as the school calendar or the special calendar for budget making; of programs—curriculums with their administrative controls; of norms or standards or specifications, such as achievement and graduation standards, health norms, and specifications for items of supplies and equipment; of routines, forms for recording data or for transmitting reports or for use in locating information in files or objects in storage; of methods to be followed, such as those used in com-

puting salaries, in preparing payrolls, in earning promotion, in determining pupils' progress toward graduation, in computing school costs, in reporting, or in presenting inquiries or requests.

If the reasoning of this chapter is sound, it seems clear that school government can be conducted on a proper plane only if it is carried on in terms of sound principles, principles that can be developed only by a careful study of the educational needs of the people and of the schools themselves, principles clearly formulated or openly declared as policies. It is clear that school policies cannot be separate from one another but must represent a unified system of government, government for schools that are designed in terms of the educational needs and possibilities of the community and as expressions of and in the interest of the people—their political, economic, cultural, religious, and recreational interests, purposes, processes, and aspirations.

In the development of policies, it seems clear not only that school policies must be sound as to purpose and be based upon the nature and processes of education in the case, but that they must be formulated by the people most responsible for their application in management. As to the nature of the policies themselves, it is clear that they are not to function as law only in the sense of restricting action, but to move largely as a guide to all thinking and all forms of activities. Sound policy provides for a right placement and use of authority and for a right and proper use and application of facts and of the public will, as well.

Sound policies formed to fit local conditions are needed in small and large schools alike. The policies for a school system should represent a major feature of its system of government as set forth in its book of rules and regulations.

Chapter 10. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND SOCIAL USAGE AS ELEMENTS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

This chapter is concerned with the part played in administration by the forces that make up what we call our way of life. What the nature of such forces is, why they must operate, what their practical bearing is, how they affect rule by law, how they may combine with and be enhanced by the powers of science, how they may conflict with self-interest, and how they can be turned to positive account in administration are considered.

The administrative function is examined, to show how this social element helps to complicate the problem of safeguarding the element of responsibility where discretionary power is at work. Though discretion is held by law, in part, and by the force of facts, and by the way of life, it rests somewhat with the individual to decide its use. This raises the question of how to ensure that the individual may will to be responsible.

Three approaches to a possible solution of this problem are examined. Can we compel men to be responsible? Can we induce and lead men to be responsible? What are the possibilities of self-willed responsibility? It is shown that law, facts, and public will can be marshalled as compelling forces; it is shown that by instruction, good will and leadership, men can be induced to right action; it is shown that by proper choice of leaders and by proper public recognition there is reason to expect that, in the main, school administration will be in the hands of men of character.

Typical weaknesses resulting from irresponsible leadership are examined as a basis for consideration of practices through which a sense of responsibility may be developed and the practice of it may be induced or enforced. For this, stress is placed upon advanced planning, upon a complete code of rules or system of policies, designed for keeping the public informed and conscious of its responsibilities, and rewarding leadership.

1. *Complexity of Administrative Work*

However we may view it, administration is highly complex. Its energizing powers range from that of highly objective and impersonal law in any of many forms, through social usage, either as firm as old customs and moral standards and language or as ephemeral as current style, to personal habit, attitude, and native impulse.[1] In administration as a process, some five separate types of activity are easily distinguishable, and often these can be further broken down. As a mechanism, administration is built up partly of human beings; partly of formalized principles, rules, and routines set out on paper; and partly of the physical proper-

[1] On the place of ethics in administration several valuable studies, concerned with ethics in law and with ethics in politics, suggest themselves as helpful background work on the problem of this chapter. See Roscoe Pound, *Law and Morals.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1924; also his *Contemporary Juristic Theory.* Claremont, Calif.: Pomona College, Scripps College, 1940. Also Harold C. Havinghurst, "Consideration, Ethics and Administration." *Columbia Law Review,* 42:1–31, January, 1942; also Dorothy Fosdick, "Ethical Standards and Political Strategies." *Political Science Quarterly,* 57:214–228, June, 1942; also H. Arkin, *Ethics and Legislation.* Cambridge, Mass.: Science-Art Publishers, 1945. No one of these could have escaped the influence of Jeremy Bentham's *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* or that of James Mill's essays on "Government"; "Jurisprudence"; and "Law of Nations" in Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill, *Selected Writings.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1935.

ties, with the circumstances and time that constitute environment. Finally, its objects, too, represent almost endless variety. To keep its behavior stable and true to its course requires clarity of purpose, harmony among the powers that drive, coordination of parts and of procedures undertaken, and assurance that no element will fail to play its part.

Here our special search will be for this needed sense of sureness and, so, for the nature of the element we call responsibility, and for a way to keep it functioning. Where there are so many elements at work, there is always the possibility that some may clash with others or may play their parts too soon or too late or not at all. After all, a man is one person, not ten, and he can go in but one direction at a time. He cannot give both the answer Yes and the answer No to one question; nor can he both act and refrain from acting upon an issue. Executives cannot hope to escape by side doors from the many dilemmas that await them around almost every corner. If one wields the power of the administrator, he must face its problems as they are and bear its responsibilities.

There are obvious reasons why men try to dodge this responsibility of facing things as they really are and deciding them on the merits of the case. It often sums up as an unpleasant experience—a situation that might, in some cases, create enemies to be feared. Again, the decision is difficult because often there are merits in both ways, or there are friends who plead for a decision that the facts do not warrant, or the right decision would favor people or means or ends that are disliked. But this is administration as we know it. If to these possibilities of error we add a lack of will to serve right ends in face of opposition, or a mind untrained to the task or lacking the power to judge; or if, with all these personal powers to do the right, the social forces opposed to right are still more strong, then the task of being responsible is difficult indeed.

2. *Discretion and Responsibility in Administration*[2]

Discretionary authority a necessity. Administration without some discretionary power is almost unthinkable. Law, regulations, contracts, and job assignments may go far to fix the limits within which an officer or an employee must work; but in a job that requires intelligence, a job that must deal with unforseeable facts or circumstances, or one that must find out what work is to be done or by what method it may best be done, exercise of discretion is necessary before that job can be performed well. In business, government, social life, religion, and education, alike, whenever many workers are engaged upon a task, or whenever the task involves the use of technical procedures or technical instruments or special skills or knowledges, management cannot be fully prescribed in advance. Within this realm, government by man has been and must be our answer.

The freedom to use one's intelligence in his own way is one of the greatest of freedoms. It may extend no farther than the regulated boundaries of one's office; yet it is highly cherished and is greatly stimulating to most people, even though there may be an occasional exception. In case government is established by law or by written assignment, officers and employees who are operating under the law find in the law both directions and limitations. Where the law ends and discretion begins, there is the beginning of a new or a greatly increased responsibility. There the officer must determine directions and restraints for himself.[3] When

[2] The search for a means of ensuring that men will be responsible in government is almost as old as government itself. Some aspects of the problem are well set out by Clarence A. Dykstra, "The Quest for Responsibility." *The American Political Science Review,* 33:1–25, February, 1939. See also John Dickinson, "Judicial Control of Official Discretion." *The American Political Science Review,* 22:275–300, May, 1928; or for a more exhaustive treatment, see his *Administrative Justice and the Supremacy of Law.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

[3] J. Forrester Davison, "Administrative and Judicial Self-limitation." *George Washington Law Review,* 4:291–324, March, 1936.

the law defines action, those who are being governed by it have recourse to the law in case of neglect or abuse by an officer; but when action is discretionary, there is no recourse except to claim that it exceeds or violates the law. Within this realm of discretion, which in some cases must be wide, there is no control except that within the person governing. Here we trust the employee to judge the intent of the law, to find the best way to attain its purpose and to operate in a manner fully consistent with it.[4]

What powers behind discretion? It is with this realm of discretion, or with the misinterpretation or abuse of it, that we shall be concerned mainly here. How far can we trust people to act and to direct their subordinates and to determine what shall be done for our children? How far can people be responsible for the interests of others? Can we compel men to be responsible? Can we aid them? What is the nature of responsibility in administration? When duty calls and criticism or threat or entreaty clamors against it, what is it to be responsible, to be faithful to a trust? Can we expect men to give right orders and to suffer criticism when slightly wrong orders would gain them popularity and prestige? Can we expect one to share his authority when he can easily "hold others in line" by retaining it? Discretionary power should mean freedom to find and to do the right; but such freedom does not preclude the use of wrong methods or the pursuit of wrong search, in order to make a show of justice in the choice of an end previously decided upon. It does not preclude pursuing wise and honest search and following it by action inconsistent with its findings. What is it to be responsible in service to others, with such a variety of conflicting motives welling up within us—some supported by our sense of right and others, by our fears of criticism, our ambitions, our desire for popularity or power? Discretion without the restraining and guiding power of a will to be responsible, or otherwise of some compelling fear,

[4] See Wayne A. R. Leys, "Ethics and Administrative Discretion." *Public Administration Review,* 3:10–23, Winter, 1943.

is hopeless.[5] It is the nature of school administration to require wide use of discretion. Can we expect responsibility? Can we make sure of it in advance?

3. *Some Practical Implications of Discretion in Administration*

Limiting discretion by regulations. There are several aspects of this problem of how to make sure that responsibility shall do its proper work in school administration.[6] The laws, board regulations, and assignments to duty may go as far as we find it practical to go in defining and setting limits to jobs. That far only can we use compulsion for a certainty. One's job is his responsibility. By the nature of school service, jobs cannot be sharply and completely defined; nor can they be entirely separated from one another, either by definition of rule or in actual performance. Between jobs there has to be a continuous adjustment—a give-and-take—that can result only through willing cooperation of those concerned. This "no man's land" that lies between jobs is sometimes greedily preempted by those seeking power, or is carefully shunned by those who wish to dodge responsibility. In these areas, power seekers clash and responsibility shunners hasten, each to blame the other for neglect or mistake.

These lines between jobs and functions—which, for convenience, we may call no man's lands—are many and are becoming more and more numerous and complicated as small school systems grow large and as all educational proc-

[5] However one may dislike some of Machiavelli's concepts of government, one must admire the shrewd and penetrating way in which the crafty statesman ferrets out those elements of man's nature and of society that can be most surely relied upon to determine what man or society will do under pressure of danger. See especially, *The Prince,* in Harvard Classics, New York: P. F. Collier and Son, 1910. Vol. 36, for English translation.

[6] See the author's "Administrative Discretion vs (or with) Rules and Regulations." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 29:257–283, May, 1943.

esses become more complex and intricate with the development and introduction of whole new functions—guidance, research, public relations, curriculum making—previously unknown as separate services or as distinct features of the administrative mechanism of the school. Whenever a new function has entered, a large readjustment has had to be made; for each new function has drawn out various phases of other functions and shaped them into a new and more specialized service. This took authority and opportunity and responsibility from one place and put them to work in another.

Man's natural reactions to the use of discretionary powers. In work, as well as in recreation, men like to use their talents; they aspire to higher and higher achievement and glory in each forward step. Men enjoy giving expression to their talents and ambitions in their work. In a job wherein they are not quite free to do this, they chafe and often become frustrated—at times, aggressive—over whatever is in their way. Men also like to have, to be known to have, and to exercise authority in their work. They like to sense others as dependent upon them. In both these natural traits, men vary greatly—in the former, from the dull indifference of extreme lethargy to the enthusiastic drive of genius; in the latter, from a love of anonymity to an uncontrollable will to conquer and to dominate. Whom among these men can we trust to be responsible in a position?

Luckily, such urges of self-expression and desire to rule are but part of man's native equipment. There is also the urge to be liked by others, to want to be chosen as leader, to want to be respected for talent or for achievement, to be admired or loved for qualities of modesty, gentility, honesty, sincerity, and humaneness. Man has the freedom and, presumably, the power and the intelligence to choose at will to which of these native drives he will respond—those which please and benefit himself alone or those which are in the interest of others; those toward present, or those toward

future, needs. In management, these interests often may be harmonious; but quite as often they must clash and, whether he likes or not, the officer must choose which impulses he will follow. One who habitually acts in the interest of those whom he serves, regardless of consequences to himself personally, is said to possess a fine sense of duty, a strong character. We trust such a man and speak of him as highly responsible.

Can discretion be made compatible with responsibility? It thus appears that being responsible in practical management is an extremely complicated matter. First, it is complicated because of the nature of the school service as a whole, of the character of the various functions essential in the service, of the necessary working relationships of those who serve, and of the limitations of law as a means of direction and control over workers. Second, it is complicated by the fact that human nature, being both complex and widely varied among men, is constantly facing dilemmas or situations in which decision to act involves a clash of interests in which choice to serve responsibly involves subjection of an urge to personal gain, which some have not the courage to suppress.

This reasoning seems to conclude only that being responsible, or assuring that employees shall be responsible, is complicated and difficult—easily possible for some, perhaps, but virtually impossible for others, and involving some struggle of will by the majority of men. For ages government has sought for ways to compel men to be responsible, but perhaps this is a new problem for each age and each institution and each position. There is, however, the further question, whether men can be persuaded or assisted, as well as compelled, in their task.

4. On Compelling Men to Be Responsible

Perhaps compulsion and persuasion are little more than separate points of view or angles of approach. Action under compulsion is, after all, by choice made among the possible

ways to act and this is true of action by persuasion or assistance, or by free choice. Yet, there is a difference. Whoever acts by coercion puts little will to his efforts; if one acts by persuasion, there will be some will; but if by free choice and purpose, there will be the stronger will.

Compulsion by law and by custom. Compulsion may be effected by several forces, as, by law, customs, accepted moral standards, social proprieties, or such inner drives as habits, ideas, and tastes. Consider compulsion by government. Law is an external and impersonal compulsion, as contrasted with compulsion by personal motives from within. What the law commands, the officer or the employee or the citizen may or may not desire, but he must obey or accept a penalty. Yet, with discretion involved, the law's reach is somewhat short of need. Or consider control by public opinion. Our own theory of government relies much upon public opinion to hold officials true to their proper functions. Though somewhat ready at hand for use and with a quite different form of penalty, its power, too, is very real.

Since law and public opinion are to control men, these must be formed to fit the natures of men. What men fear, what they love and strive to get, what they are intellectually and aesthetically capable of, are keys to the natures which it is the purpose of the law and of public opinion to govern.

But there is still another force that is in no small part external also. We may call it the social code. If, by their own natures and the nature of society, men are held to certain ways of life, then law is not needed to cover all those ways. Such ways, the law can assume, are already guaranteed. Thus, compulsion, external, may be in part by law, in part by public opinion—knowledge and judgment—in part by the customs, conventions, proprieties, manners, morals, speech—the way of life—of the people. These social forces are in a manner external, objective forces, which compel within their realms as effectively as does the law.

Self-control as compulsion. But all the external forces

that bear upon and compel men do so, to a great extent, in terms of the inner drives that motivate men. Fear of the penalties of the law and fear of public opinion or of breaking the social code hold men to duty.[7] But love of praise, of friendship, and of public commendation also tends to cause one to adhere to the requirements of law, of public opinion, and of the social code.

Our laws assume the existence of these other controls and, in many cases, are direct instruments for enforcing them upon recalcitrants. There are legal penalties available for use against many possible abuses of the moral code. But social penalties fall automatically upon still other offenders not quite reached by the law. The law can punish for murder or theft or personal abuse, but hardly for the simpler forms of impoliteness or even for forms of conduct we would call very coarse or even immoral or vulgar. Yet most people would be almost as careful not to acquire a reputation for social crudeness as they would be to avoid breaking a law. The jail, a fine, adverse public opinion, and social frown or scorn or banishment—these are alike compelling to most people. This is the way of civilization, the nature of civilized individuals. These forces operate as controls and as drives to action.[8]

[7] Public opinion is a product of the intellect, formed by a process of discussion and exchange of information and ideas. Judgment and knowledge are its powers. The social code is not solely rational; in fact, at points it may be mere unbounded prejudice or habit or fear. By long use it is a social force. However, it is powerful, because in its essence it is personal belief, habit, attitude, will. Basically, its power is personal and internal, rooted in the self of each member of society. Breaking the social code offends each individual member of society and invokes dislike, disgust, or even hatred and attack against the offender. See A. Lawrence Lowell, *Public Opinion and Popular Government.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1913.

[8] James Barr Ames, "Law and Morals." *Harvard Law Review,* 22:97–113, December, 1908. Also: Frederick R. Coudert, *Certainty and Justice.* New York: D. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1914.

5. *On Encouraging and Assisting Men to Be Responsible*

Man and his system of culture. Friendliness, cooperation, mutual protection and affection are characteristics of society. Underlying these are human nature and human need. The family is biological as well as cultural in origin, and society is but an extension of the same forces.[9] Need for companionship and for protection and for power to win against enemies held people together. Life together produced habits, attitudes, tastes, and modes of life that brought pleasures and security, and these added greatly to the reason for living together. The way of life grew wiser and more complex. As civilization grew, many personal urges had to be submerged in favor of interests of the group.[10] Deep-rooted drives of nature not infrequently suffer frustration and break the bonds that society's ways have formed, whereupon the offender loses caste, as a penalty, or runs afoul of legal restraint. Sometimes society may learn something useful from such breaks with established ways, whereupon social change, perhaps progress, results.

In the course of social evolution this native cement that holds men together exists as values that have become real to man; it is no less a fact after the coming of laws than before.[11] From family to tribe to state is a matter of slow evolution. In the process the old forms of control are dis-

[9] The purpose here is not to assume that the biological and cultural origins of traits are wholly separable or that there is any point in trying to separate them, but only to stress the fact that some of the drives that lead to action are very strong and deep-rooted, while others are weak in comparison because they are of but recent origin.

[10] If one considers how a culture is developed, it should not only be easy for an individual to be devoted to the interests of his society and of his own institution, but it should be natural for him to have a strong inclination to be so devoted. For a consideration of this point see Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Background of Personality.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1945.

[11] Roland L. Warren, "The Place of Values in Social Theory." *Journal of Social Philosophy and Jurisprudence,* 7:223–239, April, 1942.

carded but slowly, if at all, for they are deep-rooted in man's nature, and each of the old native forces has to be borne down by more urgently needed ways of life.[12] Need for a new way of life may exist for ages before the need is clearly felt or before a suitable way to meet it is found. Much of the way of life that we call civilization is highly complex and is distinctly rational, even though in the origin of its parts it may rest upon a stratum of more instinctive ways of life. The higher one goes in the scale of civilization, the more complicated is the task of growing into true membership in one's society.

The teacher or the school administrator lives a life far back from the immediate task of outwitting old sabertooth or finding food by long and dangerous search. The field of education is a realm of safety and calm, as far as these basic needs and these more primitive ways of life are concerned. Indeed, success in the realm of education is dependent upon the use of processes that must run counter to many forms of felt need that were so useful and that counted for success in primitive times; education is a realm of know-how.[13]

School administration must use the power that is implicit in our culture. If so brief a sketch does not mislead too much, several things may be inferred from it. School administration is, in a manner at least, scientific. It has to be learned. Since it is carried on by and for and in terms of individuals, it will have to recognize all the factors that motivate human beings and not those alone that have been acquired by study and experience. This is a great task, and neglect of it is almost sure to cause some measure of failure. Men usually work well together if it is in face of common

[12] For a most stimulating treatise on the use of social factors in practical administration see Alexander H. Leighton, *The Governing of Men.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1945.

[13] For a stimulating study of need as a basic consideration in the development and maintenance of the elements of a culture see Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

danger and better still if, besides the urge of danger, they feel joy in the companionship involved or in joint achievement. In either case they will accomplish more if they know well all the purposes, rules, and techniques of the enterprise.

In school administration there is present some urge to make sure of safety—against accidents, fire, infections; normally there is joy in professional comradeship, strongly supported by personal and professional ambition; as for knowledge, it is always present, but seldom fully adequate. Administrators may know education, they may know what to do and how the schools should run, they may know teachers and children and parents and school boards. But knowledge can play its part well in school management only if *all who are concerned* possess it. To see that all shall possess it in kind and amount and at a right time is, indeed, a function of administration. Only when full knowledge is possessed by all of society can it give birth to new and compelling social power over men.

It is not enough to feel the urge of anxiety, as from danger of fire or a broken banister or a jammed door; full knowledge of such danger and of all possible ways and plans for meeting it, and a spread of that knowledge to all who might need it are quite as important. It is not enough that there shall be good will among children and staff, there must be something for that good will to accomplish, something upon which its energy can be spent. Morale that is achieved by backslapping and expressed in social exchange alone may be better than morale that is broken by factional strife and personal antagonisms; but a morale that results from common purpose and understanding, backed by a common ambition and will to achieve, is a morale that will last far longer, for it will give stimulus to work as well as to relaxation. This is because it rests upon things of true value, things that really attract or drive men to action.

In this interpretation it is easy to see not only the obligation, but also the opportunity, of administration. In a way,

such analysis reveals the raw materials with which administration must work and suggests approaches for stimulating and assisting action toward responsibility. For, if full consciousness of possible dangers to self or others or to one's reputation must be kept alert; if full and widespread knowledge for all, of purposes, materials, and processes, is essential; if will to achieve can be enhanced by welding such individual wills into a common group enthusiasm, having a goal consistent with the purposes of the management, then a "forward-together" movement must result. Can management contribute leadership for this and not try to achieve the welding by false propaganda and indoctrination rather than by rational illumination?[14]

6. On Responsibility Self-willed

Why do men strive through life? Can man find satisfaction in carrying the burdens of others? Perhaps so, when such burdens are identified with and inseparable from his own interests. But that is dodging the question. It is natural to strive for what one wants, but it seems equally natural to avoid unnecessary effort or effort toward unwanted ends. School work is interesting to many people, but it is exacting and fatiguing. To stand up to full duty, day in and day out, requires endurance and a certain zeal for the work itself or for the ends it serves or for intelligence and honesty in service or, perhaps, for all three of these.

Ends that men work for are both immediate and remote. To gain a remote end, one's efforts may appear more self-sacrificing than they really are, since at the moment they seem to be so unrewarded. It is less the nature of man than of other animals, however, to live in the present alone. The squirrel hordes food for the winter and builds a nest for its anticipated offspring, but man goes far beyond these pri-

[14] The element of leadership must play a large part in an activity that is so much an art as is administration. See Harold W. Stoke, "Executive Leadership and the Growth of Propaganda." *The American Political Science Review,* 35:490–500, June, 1941.

mary needs to plan for years ahead or even beyond his generation. In many ways each man becomes a partner in an ongoing stream of human effort to achieve ends, not for self alone, or for family or business, but for community, church, club, school system, city, country; or for the furthest goals of science or art or philosophy.

Thus man's urges are as wide-ranging in type as in their reach through time; and though they may often aim at present needs first and, in the distance, at security first, yet that is not the end, for they often point quite beyond oneself and one's own time. In the strength of these urges and in the ability to act effectively upon them men vary widely, as they do in their relative emphasis upon the selfish or the social ends that they seek.

What makes for our choice of career? In the choosing of a career, one's native tastes and abilities may assert themselves strongly or be pressed into the background by acquired tastes, attitudes, sets of forces, beliefs, habits, knowledges, or external circumstances—whichever of these may be stronger in the case. When one has taken extended training for a career, it is reasonable to assume that the choice has stood some preliminary test. A career in education offers reward of pay, but not a large reward. Society prefers that those who enter this career should do so—in part, at least—because the work itself is rewarding. Society prefers to be served educationally by people who see in such a career a chance for self-realization and for cultural growth. To serve well in education, since education is clearly our major direct instrument of social progress, one must believe in its purposes, possibilities, and processes; he must have physical, mental, and personality capacity for the work. Whoever is driven to work by the urge of salary only will likely measure his efforts against financial returns and seek opportunity to add to such reward. Whoever serves because he loves the work will measure his efforts against his own strength, intelligence, and aspirations and against the opportunity and need for his efforts. Few will ever serve

from one or the other of these motives alone. The range of relative emphasis upon one or the other will be wide, even among carefully selected men.

The long period of training with its wide variety of tests, the practice tryout period, the in-service education program, and the careful selection of leaders from those who have demonstrated executive talent are our means of sorting out those who have capacity to serve. But choice, at the start, can be made only from among those who come. People who see in education a suitable chance to accomplish their goals of life will not come to it if it is clear to them that the financial reward is so small or that living and working conditions are so mean as to make achievement of their goals unlikely. So, neither in the applicant's nature nor in the external reward for service do we find the one suitable approach for getting men who have both right motives and sufficient talent. Reward and career opportunity are bound together as drives. Jobs seek men and men seek jobs. Accordingly, as society raises its demands for quality it must raise its reward for service to fit. War service drew many away from education, partly by force of law, but partly by force of opportunity offered. Commerce and industry, too, make their appeal.

On choosing men who have a will to serve. This much we can be sure of: Man has a tendency to choose a career that fits the urges of his nature; effort, in strength and quality, is strongly affected by the character of the urges back of it; we know what types of urges are best adapted to the requirements of service in education; we can train best for our service those who have natural likes, as well as talents, for it; by proper study and tests we can choose those with suitable native equipment, interest, and will to serve. It seems a fair certainty, therefore, that in education a large percentage of those in service have better than average capacity for self-willed effort to be responsible in that service. True, we have known exceptions. The domineering boss, the climber, the shirk, the show-off, the know-it-all—

the schools could hardly fail to have a few of each of these, for "promising young men" sometimes do not attain the expected goal; and some who strive, at first, become frustrated by a little failure or unexpected opposition and turn cynic. Furthermore, life goes on, the relative strength of one's inner drives can change greatly—almost certainly must change. When the stimulus of novelty is gone, when the test of strength is severe, when things go wrong all round, perhaps because someone played false, one finds his sense of values altered. For one, such experiences may end in broader perspective, a deeper understanding, and more determined will to serve; for another, in indifference, a sense of defeat, or aggressive discontent.

Because large numbers are concerned, we must think in terms of averages, of the modal type, and not of the few extremes at either end. Among men engaged in school administration, this average should be high, not merely because the law holds men responsible here, as it does in other callings, but also because we sort out and try to choose men who are driven as much by their own desires to serve and to attain the goals of their assignments as they are by money compensation. We try to apply the principle that being responsible is best assured when the object of the inner personal urges of life and the object of the task are one.

7. *Where Responsibility Often Fails to Function*

Can our reasoning be applied in practice? In this bare outline, we have attempted to indicate the framework or, at least, the essential elements of a theory of how to approach this matter of getting responsibility to function in administration. We may turn now to the question of applying and testing these ideas and principles at work. In practice do we sufficiently regard the possibilities of compulsion by such external forces as law, public opinion, professional ethics, social standards, or even physical forces and circumstances? Do we take proper account of the possibilities of

control from within by native impulse to strive for right action, by the driving force of impulse, or the beckoning power of ideals?

Administration takes up where legislation ends. The law commands or permits; the board of education specifies how the law shall operate; and administration executes, reports back, and recommends. To run a school system requires properties, personnel, program, and equipment. It requires the formulation of purposes and the organization of plant facilities, personnel, program, and children. It requires the development of intricate processes, the handling and care of materials, and the care and instruction of children. Children and teachers and administrators, all alike are moved to action by their own natures, as well as by external forces and circumstances. The parents, too, and taxpayers and citizens are parts of the enterprise. Administration must interpret its orders; it must plan, organize, direct, coordinate, and control these many factors. It is responsible not only for doing, but also for finding out what should be done.

Administration is guided as much or more by the principles and facts and skills of science and art in education as by the dictates of statutes and rules and decisions and orders from above. Back of every task there is the question, antecedent, of how the task is to contribute to the major purposes of education. When a move has been decided upon as necessary, there is the question of how it should be performed and when and by whom. Administration must go further and determine whether the work was done and how efficiently and must estimate the worth of the contribution it has made; and go on still further, to order that it be continued, repeated, changed, or stopped and, if the latter, to decide what shall be chosen in its stead.

Application by no means simple. Typical difficulties arise. Rules for ordering materials about do not apply so well in ordering people. What one is told or asked to do might be quite acceptable or fully desired by the doer, were it not for the manner of the asking or ordering. Orders that

should be expressed as knowledge or information are offensive when they are enforced by authority alone. Doing things without previous planning is often wasteful and annoying, but being responsible for plans made by others and received as an order, can be even more so. It takes time to be forever explaining, say some executives, and more time to reach a decision by discussion, argument, and wrangling; therefore, it is better to order than to argue—some people are so talkative; others, so insistent or so sensitive or so slow or so impatient.

Some executives love to hold every grain of authority, lest others might take some initiative or lest their own powers may be so much depleted. Some try to use their authority for personal ends, to cover which they will avoid straightforward dealing; or, protected by the dignity of their positions, may reach beyond their powers and try to achieve their ends by bluffing. Some who prefer always to do the right will fail as to courage when pressed by fear of criticism or the clamor of friends. A superintendent who fears his board's displeasure may find it easier to follow than to oppose its wishes, even though he must thus impose upon the schools injustice or unscientific procedures. A domineering faction within a staff may often compel administrative decisions to an extent quite out of proportion to the merits of its demands, all because the administrator lacks the courage of his convictions.

In the management of so complex an enterprise as a school system, one cannot expect smooth running everywhere. Endless difficulties are sure to arise, endless differences of view are sure to appear. There will be conflict in setting up purposes and at every step along the way to evaluation of the final output of effort. If there were no conflict of opinion or judgment, no effort to have one decision made in preference to another, it would be queer indeed—and a fair indication besides, that things were not going well for the children. It is only because there are such difficulties that administration has been separated from performance

and elevated to a position of power. Solving difficulties is the function of administration. This function is a scientific one when by its study and ingenuity it is able to solve most of its difficulties by anticipating them. That this work should constantly test a man's knowledge and his personality and character there can be no doubt. Authority is an essential element, but authority in education cannot enforce full responsibility; neither is it of a nature to protect the administrator from having to face continuous tests of his own will to do the right.

Ruling in advance avoids many forms of difficulties. Man made the laws; men make the rules, develop the policies and plans, and later give the orders. Thus, twice, the natural inner urges of man have a chance to assert themselves —once, while making the laws and, once, when enforcing them. A failure to see and do the right in either case is possible, either because of inadequate knowledge and understanding, because of lack of skill, or because, for some hidden reason, a wrong way is deliberately chosen.

It should be easier, because less personal, to deal justly and wisely when making a rule or a plan for future use than when passing judgment on a case at issue. Rules are for the future and must try to anticipate the future's needs— and thereby settle troublesome issues before personalities are attached to them. Yet many administrators fear to make rules and plans and decisions that reach far ahead. Some fear because they themselves, along with others, must take the consequences of such advance decisions. It might fall to the administrator to enforce the rule against a friend or in favor of an enemy; and if he is only a little vain, he feels that it would at least rob him of the pleasure of having people wait to hear his decision on a case when it had come to hand.

Thus, our human weaknesses do battle with our better selves through life. Whether it is ignorance or native urge that leads to wrong decision may not be clear at times. Both of these powers are strong and ever present in all men

in some degree, at least. Some who consistently will to do right, but often find themselves doing wrong, usually suffer from ignorance, often backed by inertia or laziness. Some, who are able in knowledge and diligent in developing it as needed, have lack of will to act upon it, or sometimes, they exercise both will and skill in getting around the facts to wrong decision. But administrators, as a rule, are not mere putty to be pushed this way or that, whether by knowledge or a lack of it, or by any single inner urge. The majority of them are positive, aggressive, on-going men. They try to know, they try to choose the right, they act with fair courage and reasonable skill. The majority of them can and do decide and act with fair balance between promptness and deliberation. It is because they have this balance and possess favorable qualities that it is worth while here to try to find what a proper use of knowledge and right impulses can do in management and how to arrange to bring these favorable powers to fruit in responsible service.

8. *Keeping the Law Abreast and Active*

Laws and rules provide for decisions in advance. By law let us agree to mean, here, not statutes and board rules alone, but also, all official adoptions or decisions—plans, programs, assignments, routines, forms, in whatever mold.[15] Whatever represents the power of legal authority—for purposes here, that will be called law. The constitution, the school code, state board of education regulations, local board rules, all board decisions—the acceptance and signing of a contract, formally requesting the superintendent to recommend on a case before it, adopting a curriculum, ordering the introduction of a specified system of reports

[15] Concern here is with the nature and use of our "way of life" as a force for helping to keep administration responsible. Our laws are but a specialized expression of our traditions, ideals, and social needs; and use of law in administration is bound somewhat by these same matters. Laws are more formal but may, in fact, be no more binding or compelling than are our customs and social proprieties.

and accounts—all these have the force of law. Some are law in the sense of providing for the disposition of cases in advance, some are decisions on matters that are to operate as guiding plans or procedures, others are but final dispositions of cases that end and merely stand to enforce that end.

It is suggested above that there is better chance of deciding things on the basis of fact and justice if they are dealt with in the abstract and before the facts and principles are attached to a concrete case, since, through cases, personalities enter to distract attention from fact and principle. It is obvious that in the handling of a school system there are many thousands of problems that cannot be foreseen and, so, cannot be fully provided for in advance. At the other extreme there are other thousands that can be foreseen and quite fully planned for. Between these extremes are cases upon which planning in advance might help; but unless the plans were very wise and farseeing and perhaps elastic, the planning might prove a hindrance. There is certain to be difference of opinion among men as to how far to go with rules in this middle realm. The timid and ignorant or vain man, as well as any who likes to wield authority, will likely not want to venture far.

Weaknesses in this area of administration. By and large, we have not gone far enough in most school systems, either with planning or with regulating in advance. For this there are many obvious reasons. Our school systems have grown so fast that it has been difficult either to fit existing laws to the changing tasks or to devise new laws. One cannot draw a rule to govern a situation until he knows it and knows what he wants to accomplish and how to accomplish it. Laws and rules to determine action in a school system cannot ignore the laws of science as they apply to learning, teaching, counseling, supervision, administration. Here, too, there have been rapid advances, and parallel to science is the question of ultimate ends—the values that we seek to gain through schools. To write the rules for running the schools, one must know his science and philosophy of edu-

cation, as well as the constitution, the laws, the people, and the available resources and facilities.

Tradition and inertia, too, have played their parts in keeping planning at a low ebb and preventing law from growing in school management. Ways of doing have grown up bit by bit and, because they worked—or at least, did not clash too much with the accepted way of life—have come gradually to have the force of law. Whether viewed as inertia and complacency or as the pressure of custom, they have been hard to change because whatever is backed by common acceptance has force such as that of law. To change such established ways of life is extremely disturbing; and it is not unusual to find practices long accepted that are, in fact, quite inconsistent with the dictates of knowledge. At times, it will be argued that to change these would do more harm than good.

A third reason why school practice is behind in its development and use of laws and rules in administration is that too many lack the knowledge required to prepare a set of rules. A survey of the books of rules now in use in our school systems is most convincing on this point. An adequate set of board rules would provide a full coverage for all major purposes, plans, and programs and of the material, organization, personnel, and processes essential to a school system. It would establish authority and provide for its proper flow, for the definition of responsibility and who should bear or share it, and for the development and use of knowledge to fit the authority and responsibility required. Such an instrument of government would express our social, political, and educational philosophies; it would express the findings of science as these might dictate the processes of teaching and learning and management, or of health and economy and social life in the school.[16] One cannot prepare a set of rules which, in effect, is a master plan for administering a school system without having a

[16] Jesse B. Sears, *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

wide and deep knowledge of education and its purposes in our country.

The need for laws, rules, policies, plans, can and should be met. These difficulties—rapid changes in school systems that are due to growth and to scientific developments; to tradition, inertia, and established ways of doing things, ways that resist change; and to lack of knowledge and understanding required for such a task—are standing and always will stand in the way of progress in this as in other fields of effort for social improvement. Lack of vision, lack of courage, and lack of understanding have always held out for the status quo, good and bad alike.

To say that the task of setting up a system of intimate law to guide the schools of a district is difficult does not prove that task impossible. The reasons for a system of rules, as for advanced planning in any project, are compelling. The importance of having carefully considered goals and guides to action for reaching them is obvious; to be ready and to feel that all others concerned are ready to move in harmony assures economy of effort, lessened anxiety, and a sounder morale; to have carefully developed purposes and studied plans and procedures assures less trial and error, with the waste they entail. As to the difficulties and possibilities of formulating a sound system of rules, let the administrator face these truths: If we know our purposes in education, we can set them out in words. If we cannot state our purposes, surely we cannot plan for them or give directions for their execution. That is, the function of administration exists at all only if it can plan and direct; otherwise, there is no excuse for it. What is true of purposes or aims is true of program, of personnel, of organization, of major procedures, of plant and equipment and care of children. Thus, administration dares not admit that it cannot set up a system of guides and rules for running the schools.

Responsibility rests with educational leaders. If such a system of law so obviously is needed for schools, if adminis-

tration is compelled by the logic of its own position to provide for such rules, how does it happen that so many schools do not provide for this need? The answer has been given above—the complexity of the task, tradition, inertia, and ignorance are responsible. That is the diagnosis, and for it there is a sound prescription—use law to compel action. State school laws have empowered school boards to prescribe such rules. Boards have only to command their employed experts to prepare such codes. Lawyers cannot prepare them, for they must embody and clearly reflect the laws of science as these laws apply in education, and only students of that science can be entrusted with the task. If school administration is anything more than time keeping or clerking, if it is more than bossing or than traffic directing or running errands, then building and rebuilding this system of rules is the heart of the job; for in these rules there are the purposes, the policies, the plans of action, the procedures, the controls that guide.

If the case appears the other way round—if the employees want a system of rules but the board objects, as sometimes happens—then action cannot be forced by authority of law, but, instead, must depend upon the power of leadership and logic. It cannot be argued that the school executives or that any school employee has no responsibility in this matter. It is their responsibility, as experts, to point the way to right action. This responsibility is inherent in the nature of the service they are employed to perform, in the fact that they can perform such service only if they have been legally certificated as experts. The authority they hold is not only the legal authority to serve as the board may assign, but also, the authority of the knowledge that they possess and the authority inherent in their obligation as experts to apply that knowledge in their work. When a board neglects or refuses to have a book of rules, there is in the nature of educational service—especially, of executive service—the obligation to point out the need for rules as a means to orderly planning and to economy and equity and justice in manage-

ment. Whoever does not meet this obligation is failing in an important way to be responsible.

9. *Keeping Social Forces at Work*

The culture pattern, a force for control in administration. It is asserted above that men are in no small way held to their responsibilities by social forces or by what we may think of as our way of life. This includes our common traditions and beliefs, our customs, conventions, moral standards, proprieties, forms of speech, and manners; it includes public opinion, which, once formed and known to exist, stands as a threat of active attack against, or of support for, its object; and it includes professional ethics, the specialized set of proprieties and interpretations that, by long usage and often by formal adoption, has come to govern the more important relationships among people engaged in the work of education.

To some extent these social forces are so much a part of the individual that they operate automatically to govern his life.[17] They are personal habits, attitudes, beliefs, and tastes that cannot easily be set aside. Once established, they are traits or characteristics of the self of the individual. Others are less a part of the individual, in that they are more recently learned, less often made actual use of, less apparent in practical affairs, and in that they exist in the mind more as standards to be respected than as personal impulses or motives or tastes. Still others are as clearly external to the self as is a statute or a regulation; they are norms, which one respects because others respect them, because they represent what others regard as necessary and proper in the case. They are looked to as guides to conduct, held to as bases for interpreting the conduct of others, and feared as standards against which our own conduct may

[17] James M. Landis, "Critical Issues in Administrative Law." *Harvard Law Review*, 53:1077–1102, May, 1940. This work reveals how law gets its real meanings by study of the way of life of the people.

be judged. Finally, there are those which are wholly new, wholly rational, and which are specially created for each occasion, as may be required, being formed from study of facts and by exchange of opinion. A sense of decency, forms of conduct at school, the obligation of every citizen to vote, and public opinion on any issue would serve to illustrate these several types.

How these social forces are brought to bear. By their natures it follows that some of these social forces have only to be touched off by circumstances—stimulus brings response—while others have to be thought of to be applied, much as one applies a tool. If I hold fast to a certain belief as a deep conviction—say, a principle of conduct—and if I am faced with a situation in which that belief is involved, I cannot easily avoid acting in accordance with the belief, and that quite regardless of whether it is based upon reason or only upon prejudice or fear or superstition. On the other hand, if faced by a situation in which a social standard, a propriety, or a commonly held view, or a professional norm of conduct is involved, I am likely to act less promptly, waiting to weigh my personal inclinations over against the social norm involved and then to weigh the consequences of losing the object of my personal interest against the penalty I would suffer in acting in a manner to bring social disapproval upon me. The degree to which and the certainty with which I shall be punished if I err socially are likely to be judged carefully before I decide.

The individual and society alike use and depend upon these social mechanisms as means of understanding, of self-expression, and of communicating with each other, as well as for bases for mutual trust and confidence.[18] One can use them to guide and also to justify his own conduct and, whether one likes it or not, he is conscious that society

[18] How this social stuff, both tradition out of our past and need in anticipation of our future, is used in developing law, is clearly worked out in Benjamin N. Cardozo, *The Growth of the Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924.

judges him by the care and wisdom he shows in applying them in his social relations. It is possible to bend as well as to drive a nail with a hammer blow; similarly, our social norms can be clumsily applied or positively misapplied, if one chooses. That is, by the imputation of wrong motives in a given case, it may be possible to change a socially white act so that it will appear as socially black. But this possibility of abuse merely extends the range of usage of these social forces in social intercourse and government. It adds nothing new about their nature as determiners of action.

Who may use these social forces. In a study of how these social devices may be made effective in keeping people responsible in administrative service, it is well to think of all the interests involved. The administrator, the subordinate employee, the school children, the parents, the citizens and taxpayers, the public in general, the district, state, and nation—all these are partners in the enterprise. The administrator may shirk responsibility from ignorance, from defective personality, or from choice. Subordinates may err in their judgment of their chiefs from lack of understanding, from honest differences over ends sought or the values or methods involved, or from their own personal dislikes or prejudices. So it may be with children, the parents, and the school board. But these social forces will operate, regardless of what it may have been that set them going. Either a false or a true report may rouse public resentment or produce public approval of one's acts. Here, as elsewhere, too, fire can be used to fight fire, as when a true report wipes out the resentment roused by a previous false one.

Thus it is that these social forces are available to all alike; they have only to be released and focused upon us to make us take notice of them; they can be used fairly or unfairly and to good ends or bad. They are likely to be released by any sort of incident that involves personal interests or even by the most casual public utterance or information. They

seem to swirl about us like the breezes, comforting or delighting us here and annoying us there, a constant source of refuge or of danger, a medium of communication and of understanding, forces by which we may be led or driven, and which we may use or have used upon us. They are, in fact, our way of life.

Social pressures compete with personal interests. How to use and what use to try to make of these forces in holding men to duty is our problem here. It can be assumed that they will have a place as a matter both of our natures, social and individual, and of our necessities. They are as necessary as they are unavoidable. They are sure to be used and, clearly, if we are ingenious, they may be used with great wisdom and to far distant as well as to immediate ends.

If one takes these social forces apart to see what makes them work, he finds these important elements—personality traits, information, and the pertinent facts and circumstances of environment in the case. Bound up in personality are our wants and our capacities to deal with the people, the facts, and the circumstances of the case. Our wants create urges to effort; our social skills and understandings—*i.e.*, the facility we have in manipulating these social forces—determines what kind of efforts we will make to satisfy our wants; and the case in question, limited by our skills and ingenuity, will indicate what outside facts or conditions can be used directly or as points of reference.

To illustrate, when an administrator is selecting a teacher, he may have before him ten names. He may want several things—a competent instructor, one who will be industrious and socially acceptable to the staff, one who will be liked by parents and who will take part in community life, one who will accept orders without question, one who will accept orders but who will insist first upon expressing a view or upon having a say in the planning involved, one who is young and vivacious but stable, one who is a close friend, one who has views and convictions and expresses them but

who is not a fanatic or too self-willed, one who is of this or that political party or religious faith, and on and on. Of all the wants that tug at the administrator's mind some will urge him strongly, others but little. But those that urge him most may or may not be found in combination in even one of his entire list of candidates. Then will come his balancing of values and, finally, his choice. If he decides to take a yes man or a close friend, he is likely, first, to consider what his other teachers may think and say. Whatever he may decide, it is fairly certain that his own personality and character, as well as his judgment, will have a say.

Social forces need the support of science. As to the part played by information in the choice, that, too, in no small way may depend upon the relative power of the administrator's several wants. Ideally, facts about the requirements of the job and the candidate (technical, personal, social) should come first, and yes-man characteristics should be treated as evidence of incompetency. There is point in taking account of what the staff (those who must work as associates of the selectee) may like; but it is important here, also, not to overlook what the staff *ought* to like in the case. On the question of having information play its proper part, we reach a point where decision need not be determined only by the chief administrator's personal likes, or by his judgment, either. Specifications for the job of teaching should be prepared by the principal of the school in the light of general policies and plans understood and accepted by the superintendent, but not by the superintendent alone. Information about the candidate should be available to the principal, so that he, too, could recommend intelligently.

Thus, by having a proper way for information to develop and to flow to points where it is needed to play a part, the danger that one personality may go along unchecked is avoided. When the candidate's name comes to the board for action, it is not only possible but desirable that the board should insist upon seeing a file of the information by which the choice was made. This may be a mere formality,

or it may become a genuine cross examination of the administrator. But that is an important board function, and only if the board really performs it will the administrator feel the pressure of the legal power of the board and, with that power, the social pressure through a somewhat public examination of the motives that led to the choice.

What outside environmental matters may be brought into the picture will depend upon the circumstances of the case and the way it develops. If a school principal is asked to assist in a selection, he will do one thing; if ignored, he may do another. He may protest, he may bring the matter to the attention of his own staff, he may file an objection with the board, thus bringing into the case the pressure of legal authority, of professional ethics, and, in a small way, of public sentiment. If the principal is incompetent or has nothing to offer, then the superintendent must go ahead without him. What part these social forces may play will depend greatly on what sort of persons the principal and the superintendent happen to be.

It is apparent that the administrator may be moved to act by his own personal wants; that he has power to develop and to use or to ignore pertinent information; and that in some measure he can manipulate the case in hand to avoid unwanted pressures from the environmental situation. It is equally clear that he can dominate a situation more easily if the social forces are inactive than he can if they are active. Our question changes, therefore, from what part social forces may play to how provision can be made for their being active, how it is possible to make sure that they are operative.

Social forces can and must be used aggressively and with understanding. Above, consideration was given to the question of how to keep the forces of law active so that legal authority would do its proper work. Properly used, law creates authority, places it in specific positions, and defines its limits and its uses. It establishes all the major purposes, programs, material, personnel, machinery, and proc-

esses of the school system. Incident to this, it provides for the accumulation and use of information in the management. If this job is well done, there will be a clear-cut program, a clear definition of purposes, well-defined assignments, and established routines. There will be place for knowledge, just as there will be for authority; and all will expect and depend upon knowledge, as they do upon authority, to do its part.

It is obvious that any group of professional workers must use authority to carry on such a complex social, governmental, and educational service as a school system, and that there is great point in using that authority wisely, not only to direct and control but also to provide needed information. But as has already been noted above, much of the work has to be discretionary and its proper performance is assured, not by law, but by the worker's sense of loyalty to his obligations to carry on in terms of the requirements of facts and principles and the ethics of his calling. To get knowledge and ethics to do their proper work is the problem. It is not enough for one merely to refrain from being unscientific and unethical. What is needed is for all to be actively, even aggressively scientific and ethical in their work and in their relationships with superiors and subordinates and with the public.

The obligations of administrators to lead in the development of ways and of standards of conduct in these areas is very great. First, the administrator should use and insist upon scientific and ethical procedures and should definitely discourage any other kind. If his own example is not enough, he should use his authority to compel it. Further, he should encourage and never discourage honest question or criticism, even if it should fall upon his own work. He should find suitable ways to penalize bluffing and pretense, or overmodesty or general inertia. To meet his obligation in these matters, he must be alert, active, cooperative, and able to take and to give information and criticism. A faculty whose membership holds to proper standards in these

matters would soon develop a morale that would be sound, because it would be built of the proper stuff. Such a morale, as an established way of life, would stimulate an interest and give enjoyment to all concerned; but at the same time, it would tend to hold all alike to their proper responsibilities. Thus, as administration develops and enforces standards upon others, it develops a morale and establishes a way of life that it likes even though the way turns back upon itself and compels it to live up to those same standards.

Normal and healthy social relationships, providing a free flow of these social forces, tend to bring information into play; and the more information we use, the more likely we are to be properly discriminating. The more we rely upon science, the more we are likely to bring equity and justice and good comradeship into management. The point to stress here is that these social forces can operate either on a very low plane or on a very high plane. If they are left to be what they will, no one can say in advance on what plane they will operate. Selfishness, dog-eat-dog, personal pull, domineering, holding to the past as such, and power politics represent social forces working badly. Frankness, cooperation, wide and constant development and dissemination of facts, free expression of opinion and criticism, and fair play represent the same forces operating on a high level. The one is mean, sordid, and negative and is based on the lower impulses of small people. The latter are cultivated, stimulating, and positive and are the fruits of higher impulses of civilized people. Toward which of these extremes the social forces of a given school system may lean most will rest largely with those who serve. Without aspiration toward them, and without positive effort day by day, all standards of cultivated life tend to be neglected and, later, to be lost. Civilization is a thing achieved, a thing that has to be maintained; only the bare circumstances permitting it happen by chance. If we want to be in a profession that represents a highly civilized use of these social forces, we must not only use them wisely ourselves, but we must help

to make it both rewarding and necessary that those about us shall use them wisely.

10. Keeping Ourselves Responsible

Administration not wholly objective. It is apparent that, however fully we may use legal authority, however intelligently we may use knowledge and social forces, we cannot reach complete objectivity in the administrative process. Behind all our external forces there still stands the administrator, himself, never quite separate from the tools that he uses and the powers that he commands. And of those through whom the administrator works, the same is true. Employees can be commanded only so far; beyond that, they must rely upon their own impulses, capacities, and choices of conduct.

A profession cannot be held together or made to do its work by use of external force—legal, social, or factual; a profession is more than that, whether one thinks of the people in it, or of the body of knowledge and skill represented, or of the processes by which its work is carried on. Professional work is at least partially scientific and in so far as it can be guided by facts its workers are obedient to and rely upon the facts and principles of science. Also, professional work is carried on by processes that respect and apply principles of justice and social decency, that is, by ways (a system of ethics) specially suited to its purposes and activities. Whoever joins the profession accepts the obligations to live up to and work by its standards—legal, scientific, and social, alike. To fail to use fact where fact is needed, to ignore fact in favor of self-interest, to ignore or defy the ethical standards is to undermine one's right to membership in the profession.

The nature of professional responsibility. There is a vast difference between formally accepting the obligations of membership and living in full accord with them. Acceptance may mean only that the obligations are regarded as logical and sensible, and that, if carried out, they would be

a good thing for society. This kind of reaction is typical of one who seeks the benefits of membership and who regards the obligations as satisfactory, or at least as not objectionable, but one who has no feeling of being an active, working, responsible member, who has no inner drive to maintain the standards implied in membership. Such a person goes into membership as he would go into a house—as into something ready made, something whose walls and furnishings must not be abused, but something apart from himself, something not really his to hold or maintain or reshape or defend.

This matter of being a member (of any group whatever) is not one-sided. Membership means responsible partnership, and not the mere formality of signing up. To be a member is to believe in and to care as to what becomes of the enterprise in question. One is not a member in fact unless he cares about what the group stands for and feels responsible for its activities and its reputation, as well as for the prestige it may bring to himself. When the term is thus defined, it is apparent that many who so conspicuously wear the insignia of membership in this or that are, in reality, not members, but only hangers-on—in short, parasites. Of such parasites there are several types—the lazy, the incompetent, the timid who join to gain shelter, the climber, the self-advertiser, and the power seeker who join to get opportunity to show off and to exploit self. It could hardly be that, with more than a million people engaged in educational work in our country, we should not find a few such parasites in any sizable group in the field.

Since people are free to enter educational work or not, and equally free to try to get into administrative positions, it is a practical certainty that the great majority are not hangers-on, but that they are seekers after opportunity for self-realization in a genuine public service. The majority of them have looked upon their entrance to this career as a positive upward step in life, and not as a step toward a calling beneath them, or one to be used as a mere waiting

place. Most of them are aspiring, forward-looking, vigorous, hopeful, energetic people, who believe in themselves and in their work. To them the work offers a genuine challenge, and they enter upon it with the expectation that they will continue to be challenged by it, but in the belief, also, that they can win a place of respectability and self-satisfaction in it by their own efforts.

If this is a correct picture of the men and women who make up the group we are here dealing with, it is inevitable that there should develop a special set of proprieties to cover the activities of membership in the group; that is, that there should be developed a system of ethics for the profession. It is a fair certainty that such a system would be a true expression of the wants and the inner urges of the individuals. When people want the same thing, they strive for it and, when it is attainable for all that come, they tend to work together toward it; so, in time, they form a special-interest group. Incident to this development, certain ways of life sift to the top as the accepted best ways, and these become the ethics of the group. As these ways take clearer form, the members use them more consciously and discover that they can shape them by open agreement and use them both as guides to and as standards for judging conduct.

A group that has thus formed and has grown to be a profession must have in it individuals with capacity for intellectual and social growth. These qualities are rooted deep in individual natures and can be relied upon to hold men true to the purposes of their callings. With such people, to shift from the true course is to give up, to admit weakness, and to feel degraded; to hold on with energy in face of discouragement gives them a sense of courage and power. Admitting that there are many exceptions, it still seems safe to believe that, mainly, our school administrators are this kind of people.

On being responsible in administration. Really professional people will do two things. They will work for self-improvement and they will support the development and

the use of sound methods in their work and of professional ethics to guide their relationships. In so far as effort is devoted to these ends, there is a drive not to compel, but to achieve, responsibility, and that in the very highest sense. It is clearly the duty of the administrator to set an example and to provide leadership that will stimulate and encourage others to strive for this type of self-development, without which there can be little spontaneity in a corresponding group development. Only when an individual begins to work and to think as a member of his profession can he expect to enjoy the real fruits of membership and to sense himself a part of a movement, a cause, or a great work that at once rewards and inspires to greater effort.

The hope of keeping men responsible to duty does lie, in part, in our power to compel them by the guidance and penalties of law and by the pressure of the social mechanism, or the way of life, of the people. Finally, however, it rests with the nature and the will of the individual. When that nature and will are of low order, the law and social standards will function on a low plane of efficiency; but when nature and will are of high order, then law and social norms tend to function on a high plane. Our ultimate hope is in the individual. As far as possible we should choose only those who have capacity. These we should test and train and then encourage and support, to the end that each, in his own development, will reach a point where he is in fact receiving encouragement and rewards and challenges, where he is really living his life greatly, because he believes in the upward and onward march of a great cause and feels himself a part of it.

Chapter 11. ADMINISTRATION'S CONTACT WITH SUPERIOR AUTHORITY—A PARTIAL ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN LOCAL SCHOOL GOVERNMENT

This chapter is concerned with the line of cleavage between administration and the superior authority, legislation. As concepts, the two functions are easily separable; but in American government, practice brings them so close together that at times both become confused as to their proper responsibilities.

In our examination of the practice, the functions of a school board are compared with those of various national, state, and local administrative bodies. This affords an opportunity to note how legislative, administrative, and judicial functions are necessarily interlocked in our plan of government. This analysis serves, also, to reveal some of the problems that this method of government creates for school administration.

The nature of the legislative process is examined in the light of the law that creates the board, taking account also of the power of discretion provided in the law, but with reference, here, as throughout this book, to the nature of the process involved—the process by which work of the board must be done. As the governing body, the board functions through a code of rules (general policies or principles), through special instruments or devices for the control of the actions of employees, and through direct action upon specific cases.

Examination of the board's work as a process is made by the separate study of a number of typical cases. In each case the procedure is analyzed, step by step, to show who is acting, what is being done, and what are the nature and the place of power and responsibility at each step. Through these case studies a fairly clear line is drawn between administration and legislation and it is shown how the former must contribute to the latter. This adds to the administrative process no characteristics that have not been previously noted, but it reveals administration at work in what is, perhaps, its most difficult area.

1. *The School Board as a Government Agency*

Legislative responsibility of the school board.[1] It is widely asserted in the literature that a school board's duties are legislative, with almost no exception save that of choosing a superintendent. This assumption is implied in school laws that empower boards to make rules for the government of their schools. It is implied, also, in laws that empower boards to employ trained executives and other types of experts. The fact that laws provide for lay boards but for certificated executives seems to indicate recognition of the

[1] Elsewhere the writer has examined the functions of the school board from the standpoint of the devices and procedures that a board may use in the exercise of its control over a school system. For brevity, the concept of the board function and of the devices and procedures of board control, as there explained, will be assumed as representative. Here, concern is with the nature of the process by which the board formulates and brings its various devices of control into action in doing its work, and especially with the nature of the part played in legislation by administration, or with the contact that the administrative process makes with the legislative process. See "School Board Control—The Necessary Tools and Procedures." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 28:561–580, November, 1942. For a somewhat parallel study of this relationship in the management of business enterprises, see John C. Baker, *Directors and Their Functions.* Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1945. Chap. II., "Directors and Their Problems."

principle that division of labor between board and executive will be based upon this difference in ability to do the work —technical work for the technically trained and lay work for laymen.

By virtue of his training and through his actual contact with the schools, the executive is in a position to know the schools' needs. It is considered to be his business, as executive, to indicate existing need for board action and to advise and inform the board so that, as a lay group, it can decide what the district should do. Even with general acceptance of such a concept of the board's position, however, it remains true that, in practice, this principle is difficult to apply, for where lay types of problems end and technical problems begin is not always clear.

Since at the outset the board holds all authority for the management of the schools, the school staff can operate only as the board dictates. For this reason alone, administration must work close to legislation. Besides this basic matter of authority, however, there is another reason why legislation and administration must work together. One can neither legislate for nor administer education without a knowledge of the purpose, the nature, the needs, the processes, and the products of education in the case. Since administration is controlled by legislation, its nature must be closely related to the nature of legislation. If legislation is to guide administration, those who legislate must know what administration requires for its support. From this it follows that legislation must be guided by what administration knows about the schools.

Precisely how these two functions come together must be as important in the nature of the one as in the nature of the other. A study of this point of contact should throw light upon both processes. Since the major concern of this book is with the nature of the administrative process, we may ask at the outset: Is this realm of administrative activity a separate division of the administrative process, coordinate with planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and con-

trolling, or is it merely an application or extension of some of the aspects of those types of activities?

Wide use of administrative boards in our government. Boards and commissions are widely used in our national, state, and local government. Each of these bodies is designated in law as an agency of the government for directing a specified public service. In all cases the service and the powers and duties of the board or commission are set forth comprehensively in a statute, a charter, or an ordinance. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the state board of public health, the municipal board of public works, and the district school board, are familiar examples of this kind of government machinery in national, state, municipal, and school-district affairs, respectively.

Legislative and administrative powers of such boards. In law almost all of these units are thought of as administrative arms of the government, established for enforcing a statute or for directing the performance of a service. In some cases the law involved is a single statute; in others, it may be a number of separate acts or parts of acts or an organized body of law called a code. When the task is at all complicated, the board or the commission is empowered or required to create a set of regulations to govern its own procedures for guiding those whose affairs are to come under its jurisdiction. In the case of the Office of Price Administration, of any state railroad commission, or of almost any large city board of education, this collection of regulations may be an extensive and complex body of law—law, because in court it has the force of statute law.

Power to adjudicate disputes. In some cases the board or the commission has power to adjudicate disputes that arise in its work.[2] Thus, power to make rules, to legislate;

[2] The concepts of government involved here are analyzed and illuminated in Robert E. Cushman, *The Independent Regulatory Commission.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1941; also in Frederick F. Blachly and Miriam E. Oatman, *Administrative Legislation and Adjudication.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1934.

power to enforce the rules, to administer; and power to try cases in its field, to adjudicate, are not separated but lie together in the hands of one small group of men. In our country this complex process is commonly recognized as an administrative function.[3]

Likenesses and differences among these boards. Though in a broad governmental sense these national, state, and local administrative units are alike, they also are quite unlike. They all have wide discretionary powers and operate independently in a broad field, and many of them utilize judicial and legislative, as well as administrative, procedures in their work. However, some are mainly law-enforcing and operate as checks; others are mainly directive and informative, making the rules and authorizing action on cases; while still others are creative and constructive, setting up and carrying on specified services. Most of them have all three of these types of duties, but with a major emphasis upon a special one.[4] The particular one for the school board is creative—to give form to and to carry through a service; incident to this, the board *enforces* school-attendance laws and *prescribes* directions for its employees.

The powers and the activities of these tribunals also vary widely with the nature of the assignment. In most cases, however, there has been need for broad policy making to guide the handling of cases. In most of them there is need

[3] Rules made by such administrative bodies do not create new law; they only direct the operation of a more general but superior law. The broader the creating act, the wider leeway a commission has for its own sublegislation or rules, the more complex is its enforcement or directing or administrative activity, and so, the more chances there are for differences to arise that lead to need for judicial decision. For a discussion of the rise and development of this idea in government see James M. Landis, *The Administrative Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

[4] There is a large literature on this rule-making function. See O. Douglas Weeks, "Initiation of Legislation by Administrative Agencies." *Brooklyn Law Review,* 9:117–131, January, 1940. Also John Preston Comer, *Legislative Functions of National Administrative Authorities.* New York: Columbia University, Ph.D. thesis, 1927.

for inspection or checkup—control—to ensure law observance. There frequently is need for decisions covering a wide variety of cases, often involving the adoption of plans, the establishment of organization or procedures, the assumption of obligations, the assignment of duties, the approval of executive acts or recommendations. Many of them have disputes to settle. In most of the cases the board will be dealing with matters that lead quickly into technical fields of law or engineering or medicine or public health or taxation or government or education, to handle which highly trained experts are required.

Most boards deal with several types of services. In education, expertness is widely used. Teaching, guidance, health work, play supervision, curriculum work, library work, laboratory equipment, many aspects of housing, record systems, organization, legal matters, public relations—these all suggest matters for the management of which technical knowledge is a necessity. In whatever legislating such boards may do they must take account of what the knowledge of these experts reveals about the problems dealt with. To formulate a policy for the government of the enterprise —whether it is to govern a school system, to control tariffs, or to enforce observance of standards in the field of weights and measures—requires that the technical findings shall be respected. Here legislation by laymen must be guided.

Although most of these administrative boards must employ experts, there are aspects of the board work wherein lay knowledge and judgment are adequate. In a school system, the expert may reveal what is needed, how to meet the need, and what the cost may be; yet there is the further question of whether, in the light of its many needs, the community would want this one fully or only partly met. Here, the lay board can have what should be a really expert judgment; for it is not a question of fact, but of the wishes of the people.

It is easy to see how a lay board of education could contribute wisely to deliberations upon many problems that are

in some respects quite technical. How far should the schools go with their health program, the size of the school budget, the purchase of school grounds, the question of a bond election, public hearings, types of buildings and contracts—these are technical in part only, and the common-sense aspects cover important areas.

The problem of this chapter. In a study of the contact of legislation with administration many questions arise: Where, in the process of deciding a question before a board, does the legislative process end and the administrative process begin? What are the possibilities for harmony or for a clash between the two? For instance, to what extent may administration, by virtue of the technical nature of its problems, tend to impose its will upon legislation? Or in its deliberations and decisions, what is to prevent a board from dictating in great detail what the administrator should do, and how, why, and when he should do it? Legislation could reduce the administrator to the position of messenger boy. On the other hand, in practice, an executive might be so insistant upon the importance of technical demands in the case that gradually the board would become little more than a rubber stamp. These points of contact between the administrative and the legislative processes are quite as important an area for understanding practice as for a theoretical identification of an act as administrative here, but legislative there.

All these boards are administrative agencies in the broader sense, that each is administering a special unit of service. The congress, legislature, or city council that creates the act which the board is to administer thinks in terms of a single government project, a job, a service, and enacts a law that is to define and govern the project. It is left to the officer or the board to find a way to do the work required. On the other hand, a student of government, interested in the nature of the governing process in all its different stages, will want a more intimate view of what the board does and why it does it. In a school system, the board, the superin-

tendent, the principal, the teacher, the librarian, and many others operate together to produce the school service. Legislation, administration, teaching, supervision, and other types of activities, each plays a part. Together they form a unified process, which at one point we call legislative; at another, administrative; at another, instructional; at another, clerical; and so on. Here, our concern is with how the legislative and administrative processes come together, what each does to or for the other, and how we may identify any particular act as administrative or as legislative. Are there to be found in this contact any new aspects to the nature of the administrative process or any new ways by which administration uses its various forms of power in doing its proper work?

2. *The General Character of School-board Work*

The school board and school law. The problem of distinguishing between the legislative and administrative functions is admittedly more difficult in practice than in theory.[5] A board must know the law it is to administer, it must know the schools, it must know the government and the people it is to serve. In theory the board is responsible for seeing that the school laws are put into effect; it has wide discretion in interpreting how the laws shall be expressed in practice, but it must stay within the law;[6] it performs lay types of service only, using employed experts in technical matters

[5] See Hans C. Olsen, *The Work of Boards of Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926.

[6] On the basis of recent rapid expansion in the use of administrative boards in our country, we have learned much about how bureaucracy can get started in a democracy. Federal tribunals are far from the people and, so, are likely to be called to account less quickly for exceeding their powers than would be true of local school boards. See Erwin N. Griswold, "Government in Ignorance of the Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 48:198–213, December, 1934; also William B. Munro, "Our Vanishing Government of Laws." *California Law Review,* 31:49–58, December, 1942.

to advise it and to execute most of its decisions. The board chooses its chief executive, enacts policies, adopts plans and procedures, approves or disapproves recommendations, signs contracts and warrants, and the like. This all seems clear until one considers that, in doing these things, a board seldom works alone and that, on most, technical considerations are involved directly or indirectly, requiring the talents of experts.

The board's first concern is with the law under which it is to operate. The governmental theory is that, for directing the learning of children, no detailed law can be written for all individuals and all communities alike. The task of instruction is intimate and personal with the individual, and must vary widely also for different types of communities. Scientific study confirms this assumption. Accordingly, state school law is very broad and provides that the local school board shall be responsible for filling in the gaps necessary to produce sound practice in the schools in question. The board's responsibility is to interpret the law for its application in the district. Most of our state school laws are readily understandable by a layman; yet the amount of litigation in which school boards are continuously involved indicates that the task of "filling in the gaps" of the law is not simple.[7]

The board and the schools. The board's contact with the schools seems clear enough when one considers that the board employs an executive to advise as to what it should do and how and when to do it, and that it makes all its contacts with technical school problems through this one official channel. The complexity of this contact appears, however, in the very wide range of problems that has to come to the board for decision. In almost any case, the board must consider the school law and, perhaps, city ordinances and,

[7] Edgar Fuller, "Liability for Negligence of Educational Officers and Employees." *The American School Board Journal,* 103:29–30, October, 1941; and 23–25, November, 1941. Also Newton Edwards, *The Courts and the Public Schools.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

often, the general laws of property and contracts; but beyond these it faces the practical situation locally and, with this, the scientific involvements of the problem, as well. Since the law holds the board responsible, it is as necessary as it is reasonable that the board should never make a decision until it is convinced that the right one has been found and that the decision is needed at the time. The board must know the problems it is dealing with, therefore, and be able to judge what effects its action may have. Often, too, a board must judge whether its executive is bringing to it all the problems that should come.[8]

Practical aspects of problems brought to the board are widely varied. There is the question of cost, the plan of action, or the form of wording for a policy; there is the question of how the public may react, of what pressure groups may do, or of the effect on the teaching personnel. What the people want is not always what the children need most in education, in which case the board must decide whether to act in light of the knowledge and the advice of its experts or the wishes of a tradition-bound, a selfish, or a shortsighted public. A board can defy the people but, by so doing, may lose a greater stake for the children later or, perhaps, its own position in office.[9]

The separation-of-powers principle. How to carry out the school law, how to bring the wide range of technical knowledge to bear in its work, how to keep the schools close to the people and the government—all without confusion in

[8] J. R. Howard Roberts, "The Professional Expert and Administrative Control." *Public Administration,* 7:247–251, July, 1929. Also Ward G. Reeder, *School Boards and Superintendents.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

[9] We in America take social progress to be as much an obligation of our government as is safety or the general welfare. How to make progress is often a puzzling question, not of how to reveal the people's needs for improvement or of how to bring it about, but rather, how to get the people to want it. De Toqueville called attention to this characteristic over and over, in his *Democracy in America.*

the process—is the board's problem. It is also administration's problem. By definition, legislation is law making, a process supposed to be separate and distinct from law enforcing or from judging the law's application. Our principle of separation of powers assumes the possibility of this; yet, as is obvious in our many Federal tribunals, in practice we frequently set this principle aside. In local school government, however, the tendency is to sharpen this line of cleavage and to hold the school board more precisely to legislative service alone.

It is easy to show that the three governmental functions—legislation, administration, and adjudication—often are closely interlocked in practice. Common law exists and operates, even though it was not written or made, by a sovereign legislature. It exists because legislatures and courts alike recognize it. Custom became law. Our courts, rather than our legislatures, fix the exact meaning of statutes, and to that extent they contribute to the making of statute law. In administering a service, the executive often must interpret law; and as he applies it to a wider and wider variety of cases, the law comes to have meanings not thought of by those who formed it. Thus law is said to grow with use or, better, by use, to keep alive.[10] We commonly think of law as applying to the future, and of administration as dealing with matters of the present. Yet, statutes often merely give form and legal status to practices long existing; and administration is constantly planning, and many of its decisions are in anticipation of, other possible cases to come. Thus, often and unavoidably, legislation may be intimately related to other government processes at different stages, from its origination to its final application and testing.

The closer one gets to these processes the less sure he is

[10] In his *The Nature of the Judicial Process,* Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo has developed this concept of law with fine logic. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921.) See also Roscoe Pound, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.

that they are totally separable in practice.[11] In a sense, the legislative process is incomplete until the judiciary has given its output recognition in court. Likewise, though recognized by the courts as law, the administrative decision may prove to be incomplete—in the sense of its being legally ineffective—until confirmed by a court or by a superior rule-making body. Thus it is that these three types of activities are, in reality, but points of emphasis, phases, or interlocking parts in a more comprehensive but unified process, which we call government. What is needed is a distribution of power and responsibility that will produce effective legislative service and be practically workable. Let the board and the executive each govern where its powers and abilities can produce the best results. Often in legislation a board can supply a part and the executive, with his expert knowledge, a different part. A closer analysis of the legislative service should help to reveal how each of all the available sources may best contribute.

3. *The Field of Legislation in Local School Systems*

Legislation and technical matters. If the school laws are to function, the board of education must determine the educational needs of the district and take steps to provide facilities as wisely as seems practicable under the law in the case. The educational needs of a community are not readily apparent in detail to an expert and much less so to a layman. To ascertain them in a given case, wide use of technical knowledge is required. It requires an engineer to determine whether the plan for a building is safe, an architect to determine whether it is appropriately designed, an educator to determine whether it will be suited to house the program and the people for whom it is to be built, and a

[11] For a brief consideration of the principle of separation of powers see Herring Pendleton, "Executive-Legislative Responsibilities." *The American Political Science Review,* 38:1153–1165, December, 1944. Also see J. P. Humphrey, "The Theory of the Separation of Functions." *University of Toronto Law Journal,* 6:331–360, Lent Term, 1946.

lawyer to prepare the contracts involved. Thus the development of a building or a building program is not ordinary business. In a way, it is a technical matter.

In the handling of such a problem, the board's responsibility is clear. It must employ experts to do the planning. While these experts are employed, however, there is room for lay judgment, besides. The board can judge whether to plan for an elaborate or a modest type of building. It can decide what experts to employ and what it thinks of their recommendations. It can decide many matters concerned with financing the project and with contracts for construction. It should know the tastes and the attitudes of the people who are to pay for it.

It is necessary for the board to have this technical knowledge if it is to legislate regarding a building program.[12] Such knowledge should be presented to the board as information for its use in legislation; but how the knowledge is to function in legislation is for the board alone to decide. The men who prepared it were employed as experts, not as legislators.

This seems to reveal one of the boundary lines to the field of board legislation and to show how the board is to treat that line. Contacts of this nature with the fields of law, architecture, engineering, education, public sanitation, medicine, and accounting and finance are inevitable and frequent. It is true that a board could employ only such experts as would underwrite what the board might wish. This, however, is not the intent of school law. The cure for such abuse of power is the same as for crookedness or inefficiency in general. The people are quick to recognize such a practice for what it is and, in due course, they correct it by their votes.

[12] In the business world one thinks here of how the board of directors relies upon the chief accountant or comptroller to provide this technical knowledge and advice. See Melvin T. Copeland and Andrew R. Towl, *The Board of Directors.* Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1947, p. 85 *ff.*

Legislation and community interests. A second borderline that is of importance to board legislation is the point at which its work contacts the interests and will of the people. By the will of the people, here, reference is made to the proper interests, aspirations, and desires of all the people, not just part of them. Contact with this boundary is not unlike that between legislation and the realm of expertness, in that a board should be held responsible for knowing what the public really wants in the way of schools.

It would be digressing to argue this principle of board responsibility at length here. The principle is insisted upon as basic, however, because education is so vital to everyone personally, and so essential as an expression of our way of life, as a feature of our social and political philosophy, and as a guarantee of the safety and success of our government. Education cannot function effectively to these ends in our kind of country unless the people individually and collectively regard it as their own concern and maintain an active personal and community interest in its management. When the people do not come to the school, it is the responsibility of the board to see that the school goes to the people until that relationship is restored. For this the school must become, in fact, a vehicle of community expression.

For a board to get expert help it has only to go to experts. To get at the feelings of the people is not quite so simple. A sound public opinion does not develop, or come about simply at call, and on many matters it does not exist. People who have no special objections to what the board may be doing are inclined to remain silent. Only a few are both capable and willing to go to the board with constructive suggestions. Many who have genuine objections to what the board is doing will remain silent. Some may complain to their friends, yet make no effort to carry the criticism to the board. Too often the people who do tend to make themselves heard are individuals and groups who wish to use the schools for their own interests, or they are those who

have been put in their proper places by school authorities, or they may be the occasional chronic grumblers.

A board can easily misconstrue the silence of the public on a school matter; it can misconstrue the sales talks of pretending benefactors to the schools. Yet, it is the board's business to know whether it is moving in terms of the interests and will of the people. For this purpose they can find dependable sources of information. The schools presumably maintain a public-relations program, by which the people are kept informed, and which brings to the school officials a continuous stream of information on the attitudes, suggestions, and criticisms of parents, clubs, and school employees. The results of this program should be reflected in what the superintendent presents to the board. There are parent-teacher organizations, local government officials, faculty groups, church and social organizations, business and professional organizations, all easily contacted and most of them readily interested in the schools.

The technique for tapping these sources must be mainly informal and incidental; yet, there is much to be said for an organization made up of representatives of all local organizations. In any case, contacts with all these sources should be maintained and the fruits of such contacts utilized in legislation for the schools.

Legislation and other government services. There is a third boundary of board legislation, that which separates public education from other branches of public service. As a part of our government, the schools have both opportunity and obligation to see to it that the schools fit into and operate effectively as a part of our system of government, both philosophically and practically. To achieve these ends, the schools prepare the children for responsible participation in the affairs of the state, first of all, by direct instruction. They do this, in part, by classroom study and teaching and, in part, by making the school into as fine an example of the spirit and working of democracy in our gov-

ernment as it is possible to produce for the conduct of the school service; this latter, in order that our children may grow up with understanding, with appreciation, and with some skill in respect to our government's problems and its principles and processes.

On the management side, the board should keep the schools operating not as if they were a separate interest of the people, but as if the education service were but one of many government services. The schools should not spend so lavishly that the people could not have an adequate sewer system; decent hospitals, parks, and playgrounds; safe streets; and sound police and fire protection; nor, on the other hand, should the board fail to keep the schools apace with developments in these other fields. To keep these services together in harmony calls for continuous consideration of their many points of conflict with each other and of the over-all program of government activities. There are endless points at which the schools need to work with other government agencies. On questions of public health, on traffic control, on matters of discipline and delinquency, on fire protection, on recreation programs, and in dealing with many public questions—such as work on housing—the schools must coordinate their practices with those of the city, county, and state governments. This cannot be done well if contacts of the board with police, courts, fire department, and public-health department are made only when there is some difficulty to be ironed out. There should be, instead, a continuous contact on a constructive community-wide program.

A proper recognition of these three boundaries to the board of education function will go far toward keeping local school legislation within its proper realm, and toward preventing the development of no man's lands or any overlapping between the various services. Further, it strongly suggests interests and people who might wisely be drawn upon for contributions to the legislative process.

4. Types and Methods of Legislative Work

Wide range of board activity. To establish and maintain oversight and general direction of a school system, as state law commonly requires of local school boards, involves a wide variety of work. Much of the board's work will be creative, in the sense that the board applies the authority of state law to the task of developing and running a system of schools for its community. The board literally develops a school system. Because this task is complex and the actual work must be performed through employees, and because efficiency is difficult to determine, it will be necessary for the board to emphasize the concept of control, along with that of creation or interpretation.[13]

Because of its wide range, the work done by the board will require acts ranging from the formulation of broad policies to such details as approving minor acts already completed by its employees. Sound management of legislation would call for some analysis of this work and the use of methods suited to the various types of activities. Through long experience we have built up three general types of acts; one might think of them as three methods of exercising the legislative function in local school systems. The more general and comprehensive acts would be and usually are organized into a code of board rules. Subordinate to this code there would be, second, a large number of special acts providing for detailed application of rules to cases. Both of these types would provide for rule by law—law for the board and its employees to use daily in their work. Third, beyond this, the board would deal with actual cases of business, to which it would apply existing state laws or its own regulations.

How each of these methods is used and how administration contacts the legislative function in developing and using them, is our further concern here.

Creative and control types. Within its own realm, the

[13] See Chap. 6, on administrative control.

board of education must bring the school laws into action. This it does by legislating. Its first act, however, is by necessity administrative in nature. After its own organization, the board employs an executive and empowers him to carry out the work that its enactments may authorize. For all that may happen the board will have responsibility, but it will exercise responsibility only occasionally by direct performance, mainly by enacting laws to authorize performance by its employees.

Two types of legislation, aimed at two major objectives, will be needed to run a local school system. First, there is the type that authorizes and empowers action, and, second, the type that establishes controls or prevents action. The action may be that of the board, as in signing a contract or approving a recommendation, or that of its officers or employees who carry on the work of administration, teaching, guidance, and other activities needed in the conduct of the schools or in the development, operation, and care of its properties and records. The former type of work, which functions positively, creatively, in developing and operating the schools, represents the board's interpretation of the intent and purpose of the school law. The latter operates to safeguard and guarantee efficiency and integrity in performance.

In the performance of its duties of the positive or creative type, the board, keeping in mind the three boundaries above noted for its field of activity, will have the following tasks:

1. It will determine and authorize what purposes the schools are to serve: what population is to be provided for; what types of schools and of instruction are to be available; what objectives, concepts, and standards are to guide.

2. It will authorize programs of instruction for schools and classes and individuals in accordance with the purposes adopted and in line with the needs of those who are to be provided for.

3. It will establish an organization of schools, of programs, of officers and employees, and of children, designed to fit the functions to be performed and the ends to be served, and to provide a corresponding distribution of authority.

4. It will authorize a system of housing designed to keep the housing fitted to the needs of instruction.

5. It will adopt policies and procedures to guide operations in all parts and phases of the machinery, program, and processes of the schools.

6. In order to take proper account of the boundaries above noted and to assure orderly conduct of its business, it will systematize its own procedures by the adoption of a routine of business and a set of principles and procedures to guide legislation.

For exercising its function of control, the board has two possibilities. It may effect control either by the enactment of regulations, or by the process of inspection. The former would be impersonal and would be accomplished by advance notice of requirements. The latter might be by personal checkup or by impersonal application of standards or by use of compulsory reports. A budget controls spending mainly by advance notice. An audit controls it by inspecting its results.

This division of board legislation into creative and control types of work is suggested here merely to emphasize the two points of importance in board legislation. A board is at all times either creating or controlling and often does both at once. Though these two functions seem quite separate, they are in a sense but phases or aspects of each other. We check up on results in order to know the value of what we have created. The kind of control that compels honesty and efficiency is provided not merely to catch or punish offenders, but mainly to prevent our creative work from being thwarted. Thus, to control is to guide by redirecting creative effort.

Rules and case precedents in board legislation.[14] Many of our administrative boards, national, state, and local, are required or empowered to enact rules by which their services are conducted. Boards of education are not required, but are given the power, to enact rules for the government of the schools. Laws do not say specifically what such rules may cover or how extensive or detailed they may be, but the laws do require that all such rules shall be consistent with the state laws and that they shall be reasonable.

By establishing such rules, a school board undertakes to particularize the state laws for the management of their local schools. Such a set of rules, if it is comprehensive and thorough, could serve to guide employees and also to control the management throughout. It would tend to assure, too, that the schools would be developed and carried on in terms of a plan. Such a set of rules could hardly be developed without giving thought to purposes and to the relative importance of things to be done, or without thought of the placement of authority and responsibility for doing them, and without thought of an actual program of instruction, with ways, means, and procedures for carrying it out. It would seem to assure a broad perspective for each problem dealt with and a solution in terms of basic principles, as well as of local circumstances.

Many boards have not undertaken such a systematic handling of their work, but have preferred to deal with each problem on its merits as it has arisen, taking account of previous cases in which experience might be helpful as a guide. Properly done, it would be possible by this method to develop a set of case precedents, which might come to stand as sound bases for decisions. That is, in a series of parallel cases, there would be discovered a common dominating idea or principle that would, in fact, constitute the

[14] See the author's "Rules and Regulations—Their Nature and Place in a System of School Administration." *The American School Board Journal,* March, April, and May issues, 1943; and his *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

equivalent of an official rule. Such a case precedent would have the added value of bringing past experience into the board's deliberations; but with this, there could be a tendency to examine only those elements of cases that could be used to support the board's opinions or prejudices and to overlook the basic idea or principle.

Anyone who has a standard of measure that is clear and ready for use, as in a rule, can hardly fail to apply it; when the standard is covered up by the more concrete matters and circumstances of a previous experience, as would be true in trying to use a case precedent, there is less chance that the principle would ever be applied. A judge who has had years of legal training can follow principles through cases where a layman might miss them. Accordingly, if the object is consistency and sound perspective in government, then the use of rules would seem the wiser plan.

The nature of a rule book.[15] In the preparation of a set of rules to guide the management of a school system, consideration would have to be given to educational purposes, to programs expressing those purposes, to staff, to organization, to housing and finance, to policies and procedures, as outlined above. In the devising of rules to cover these matters, account would have to be taken of the nature and aims of our government, of the nature and trend of our culture, of the capacity of the people to provide schools, of the science of teaching and management, all as they apply to the children and the community in question. Summed up, this calls for preparing rules in the light of a theory of education, as well as in the light of such obvious matters as the state school laws, the financial ability of the district, and the desires of the community.

Such a code of rules should provide a sound basis for deciding any question that might come to the board for de-

[15] W. W. Carpenter, A. G. Capps, and L. G. Townsend, *Suggestions for a Code of Rules and Regulations for Missouri Boards of Education.* Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, 1940. Also Jesse B. Sears, "Rules and Regulations for the Government of City-school Systems." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 21:175–206, March, 1935.

cision. In a book of rules, however, it could not provide answers to specific questions. The rule book would function as a body of law, not as a set of specifications or blueprints. The rule book would be thought of, therefore, as the first unit in a system of local school government, a system beginning with the state constitution and or state statutes, and extending to the district, in part through state board-of-education regulations. As law, the rules on finance, for instance, would lay down principles for governing compensation but would not specify what salaries would be paid. Specifications would appear in the special device known as a salary schedule.

Special administrative instruments. Beyond the rule book, the board would need a considerable number of special devices to direct or control action in specific matters. This group of devices might be regarded as a second unit in the system of board government. Its object would be to provide specialized tools for use in applying the principles set out in the rule book. Important in this unit would be devices for accomplishing such ends as the following:

1. To control and direct the use of finances, the rule book authorizes a budget, an accounting system, schedules for wages and salaries, wage and salary rolls, and various business and record forms, depreciation formulae, and routines of business procedure, each of which has to be constructed and authorized as a board law, for use in the system.
2. To attain instructional objectives, it adopts specified curriculums, courses, promotion and graduation standards, a marking system, work schedules, report cards, norms for class size, scholastic and other record forms, and school calendars. Each of these, when drawn up, becomes a device for controlling the schools.

Besides these fairly well established devices, each school system is likely to have many other minor ones, particularly those for office-management work and for control of the use

of library, gymnasium, and playground, or for governing games, student social activities, and the like.

Many of the acts creating these special instruments, such as the budget, have to be rewritten anew each year, though others, such as the accounting system, may stand in the original form for many years. When the change is very frequent, we may think of the board's procedure as a piece of legislation that is little different from that of approving the superintendent's request for the purchase of a piano or an additional order of teaching supplies. In both cases—that of budget and that of piano order—the board legalizes action, the former in conformity with a rule that says the schools accept and will apply the principle of budgeting, the other, in conformity with the budget itself.

It seems clear enough that, as long as the board works either at setting up major rules, or at making or enacting any of these important special instruments of control, it is making laws, or legislating. By adopting such devices, the board delegates authority or makes decisions for specified application of authority by specified officers or employees, for the accomplishment of specified ends by specified procedures, all impersonal in application, as in form.

The difference between the rule book and this collection of special devices can be defined in general terms only, and there are likely to be exceptions. The difference is that a rule is general and applies to many types of cases; whereas, these devices are specific, their object being not to declare or adopt principles but to provide for the application of principles to specific types of work. That there can be no sharp line of division between what goes into a rule book and what stands outside as a separate instrument is obvious, for the same reason that what we find in a constitution in one state may be found as a special statute in another. It is partly a matter of personal preference or, often, of the circumstances at the time of adoption. The difference in the nature and function of the two is not less important for this fact.

Transacting business concerned with cases. Once a board has enacted a code of rules and created the special administrative devices above described, it has provided general directions and fixed important limitations for the management of the schools. Basic as this work is to sound management, it is by no means all that a board has to do. These rules and special administrative instruments are major pieces of legislation. They provide a basic theory and plan of government for the district and, so, set the stage, as it were, for disposing of the continuous stream of business that has to be handled day by day. The items that appear on the agenda for a board meeting, once the above major legislative work has been completed, would run like the following:

Shall we erect a building now and at the location suggested? Shall we approve proposed alterations at the high school? Shall we develop a technical high school? Shall we grant a hearing to the group demanding a new type of school health program? Shall we assume the cost of medical aid given to a student injured in the school gymnasium? Shall we grant the use of a school auditorium for a proposed controversial address? Shall we demand the closing of a certain student club under the rule governing fraternities? Shall we regulate the dress of students participating in a certain school celebration? Shall we approve a proposed new course as part of the curriculum? Shall we employ an assistant to the director of guidance? Shall we go to court to get the insurance settlement we believe is due the district? Shall we approve recommended changes in the boundaries of certain attendance areas, in face of the complaints received? Shall we abandon or try to rehabilitate a building that has been condemned by the fire and health boards of the city as unsafe? What interest rates should we provide for on the proposed bond issue? Shall we provide rifles for use of the high school rifle club? Was the medical care given in a certain case in conformity with the board's rule? Shall we own or rent busses for the new student transport route to be opened soon? Shall we pro-

vide a rotating fund for use in support of a proposed new project at the high school? Shall we buy supplies at local stores when we could save 10 per cent by going elsewhere? Of far more trivial details there are endless numbers.

These are questions that should be settled in the light of broad policy and of general purpose and plan, and by sound procedures, such as would be clearly set out in a rule book and in the special devices noted above. However, these questions do not come to the board as matters of theory; they are concrete cases that have appeared in the course of school work. They are enmeshed in practical circumstances of varied importance. Few of them stand alone; mainly they are parts of larger wholes and their handling will affect other parts. On many of them there is a community interest to be reckoned with; some have to take account of scientific matters; some have legal bearing; and all have economic aspects. Often these interests are not in harmony as to how the board should act. Should the board act in the interest of scientific or legal or economic soundness, and perhaps defy popular demand? Or should it do the opposite? Or, if necessary, how can a suitable compromise be found?

To these questions the answer is not Yes or No. Rather, the answer depends not alone on what people want the board to do, but also upon how well informed the people's wants are. Nor does this settle the matter. If the people want something that is illegal or contrary to science or to sound economy, it should be the duty of the board, if possible, to save them from such a mistake. This the board could do, not necessarily by choosing to be right rather than popular, but by seeing to it that the people are informed.

It is by such consideration of the board function that one is made to realize that legislating is a very broad type of service; broad in the kinds of problems it has to face, broad in the kinds of activities required to treat the problems, and broad in the contacts that the board must have with people and forces outside the board that should help to shape its

decisions. If the board must reckon with science, law, and economy; if it must take note of informed public interest, then it must have ways of bringing these factors into partnership with it as it works. Here our concern is to find out how administration behaves as it contacts this complex of activities that enter into the process of legislation. A closer look at the way these factors can be brought together will be in order, therefore.

The steps or stages in legislation. Legislation centers about problems. Problems of general policy are dealt with in a rule book; problems concerned with form or procedure or control of a more specific type are often disposed of by authorizing special instruments or devices with fixed and limited use in management; and problems that are still more detailed are treated individually on merit, but with recognition of any general rule or act under which they may fall. Problems may be brought to the board for action from any of many sources. They may arise automatically by force of state law and the passing of time; the board may think of and raise them for consideration; or they may come to the board from a citizen's committee, a group of teachers, or—more often, perhaps—from the superintendent. Thus, the board can initiate legislation or it can legislate upon matters brought to its attention by others. It cannot set aside any state law that lays a specific responsibility upon the board, such, for instance, as the power to legislate.

Having taken up a problem, the board proceeds by deliberation to seek a solution for it. It is at this stage that the board tries to determine the full nature of the problem and the various implications it may have for other matters. The nature of the problem with its implications may point clearly or only vaguely toward a solution. In any case, the search for a solution is likely to go along with and closely to follow the study of the nature of the problem. These are but separate phases of the board's task, however, and there is danger that search for a solution may get ahead of the study of the problem itself, in which case the discussion is likely to become confused.

It is in the study of the problem that the board should determine whether there are scientific or legal or economic matters that need attention and in which thought should be given to what interest the public has and what interest and understanding the public should have in the matter. This applies, also, to the later stage, the effort to find and formulate a solution, which concludes with the official decision, or enactment of a ruling.

The executive's contact with legislation. The question here is what may be the responsibility of the board's executive in this work as it proceeds from stage to stage. A lay board cannot be expected to see all the implications of the science of learning and teaching and managing a school for such work, for instance, as the development of a school-building program. Is it the business of the board to ask the superintendent's help, or should the superintendent take the initiative and offer the required kind of special help as it is needed? If we accept the idea of a lay board, we have to accept the idea that the board shall have available for use such technical help as it needs for its decisions. If we accept the idea that education is technical in a far-reaching sense—as surely we must do—then, in order to manage a school system, one has to be trained. The idea of highly trained school executives has long been accepted and is well established; so, by virtue of his training, and by his responsible contact with the job, out of which the board's problems arise, the superintendent can—and, therefore, must—provide the technical advice needed by legislation.

This is to say that the superintendent's position in the government mechanism, by its own nature, clearly makes him responsible, not merely as a consultant, but as a leader. This must apply whether the problem under treatment was brought to the board by the superintendent or by someone else. In either case, the executive function is positive and aggressive as an element in the total process of governing the schools. Wherever or however action may be required, it is the executive function to consider that action in the light of school needs and to advise at the appro-

priate time, regardless of whether it is in the early or the late stage of legislation, or in that of administration, or even of execution on the job. This right and duty to advise does not give the executive any power to decide matters. Deciding is the essence of legislation.

Once the board has found and enacted a solution, the legislative function is ended and the administrative function begins. Here, responsibility and the authority to act shift from the board to the executive. Instead of advising alone, the superintendent must now lead in performance. The only way the board could stop its executive in this part would be by advising, by repealing the act in question, or by issuing a special order. It could not presume to act directly in his stead.

Responsibility of the individual board member. To look a bit more closely at the school-board function, we may need to recall that a school board is an administrative board and that it is expected to provide educational service for the district. In doing this it will not only have to be responsible for knowing the law and for formulating rules and devices by which the board's employees may put the laws to work, but it will have to remain alert and ready for continuous action on matters as they arise from day to day, as above noted. The board has the authority and must transact the business of the schools as it arises.

A school board is composed of individuals. Each member of a board is free to think, to suggest problems to the board, to inform himself on school matters, to participate in board deliberations, and to vote as he chooses. Also, each member is a citizen, elected to represent the people of the community. By virtue of this position, it is his duty to learn what the people want, to listen to people, and to give them information about the schools if they request it. How a member conducts himself in these contacts with people, in getting and giving information, is his own business as long as he respects his obligations to the schools. In a speech before a club, he may undertake to inform and advise

the community on the needs or the activities or the achievements of the schools. If he is a doctor, he may be invited to advise on the school health program. If he is an accountant, he may contribute special advice on certain curriculum content. If he is an insurance expert, he may render special help in that field. All this kind of work is legitimate work by board members. It is not board work, however, and it is not legislation, yet it is entirely legal and can be highly useful in the management of the schools, in the broader sense, if, in performing it, the member does not infringe upon the administrative function or in any way try to obligate or predetermine board action.

5. *Case Study of the Nature of the Legislative Process*

Summary of the above analysis. By the above analysis of the school-board function two points are made clear—that the board function is a broad and complex type of service and that the contact between legislation and administration (between the board and the executive) is, by the nature of the two functions, very close and at many points intricate, so that in practice it may be difficult to separate one from the other. Under the school law the whole responsibility for developing and operating the schools rests with the board. The board must produce an educational service: (1) that reflects the theory and philosophy of our government; (2) that expresses and keeps alive our cultural ideals and pattern of life; and (3) that respects and applies scientific methods, facts, and principles pertaining to the nature of the processes of learning, teaching, care, and management of children at school. It requires great wisdom to harmonize the philosophy, science, and practical circumstances and pressures of life in the building of a school system.

The school board is composed of laymen, chosen by the people from among the citizens of the district. This suggests the necessity for, and indicates our purpose of, keeping

education very close to the people—close, because we want it to be of the people, of our way of life; we want it to protect us and to help us on progressively toward our social and political goals, which include the goal of perfecting the individual as an individual. Being laymen, the members of the board cannot cope directly with all the implications of science and philosophy for education, and so the law provides that technically trained persons shall be employed for that purpose. In this provision, the laws have implied that the board shall not perform technical service, even in its own work, and, on the other hand, that the technical employees will perform that service whenever it is needed in the system. This clearly brings to the technical staff the responsibility for contributing their knowledge to legislation.

A board, in order to keep the schools close to the people, must keep the people informed and interested and, so, must draw the people into the school. To keep the schools sound scientifically and politically, it must draw the experts into its work and it must keep the schools in line with other government services. To bring these interests and talents together in legislation, the board must rely upon its executive to guide it in technical matters and upon the people to help it interpret the practical needs and the cultural aspirations of the community. Since by law the power and responsibility for decision in legislative matters rests with the board alone and cannot be delegated, it follows that the executive's contribution to legislation must be in terms of information and advice and not in terms of authority.

The school-board function is creative and constructive, in that it develops and operates a plan of education; it is restrictive and evaluative, in the sense that it must control what it creates. Board legislation classifies readily into three general types: (1) that which governs on a broad over-all scale, (2) that which provides government for special classes of cases, and (3) that which cares for individual items of business. The first is quite generally provided

through a book of rules and regulations; the second, through specialized administrative devices; and the third, by specific handling of individual items of business.

The legislative process includes several stages: the discovery and definition of a problem, study of the problem to determine what needs it may involve, formulation of a solution or a plan for meeting the need, and enactment of a rule or decision to authorize the use of the solution. Discovery of a need for board action may be made and brought to the board by anyone for action. With the board's permission or invitation, anyone might contribute, also, to the study of the problem or to the search for a solution of it; only the board, however, could make the decision upon it. The executive, being close to the school system and regularly engaged in a study of its needs, and being specially trained for this, must be responsible for leadership in legislation, in the sense that he keep the board informed of school needs and of the solutions called for.

In the light of these concepts of the legislative process and of the way the executive function relates to it, we may now turn to a closer view and a more detailed examination of how administration is to play its proper part in legislation.

The task of applying these concepts to cases. If the above reasoning has revealed the concepts and values that are essential in board legislation, it should be possible to apply these concepts and values to individual cases of board work and thereby to reveal their meaning in more concrete terms and to show how the administrative function contacts that of legislation. For this purpose, choice of cases will be made with some regard for the wide range of problems with which a typical school board must deal. This range is wide, whether we think in terms of the legal aspects of board work, or of the educationally technical aspects, or of the social implications, or of the political bearings, or even of the process of legislating itself, as such. The difference legally between settling upon a plan to issue bonds for the

district and deciding to approve payment of a bill for current supplies is very wide. The difference scientifically is wide between acting upon the adoption of a curriculum, with policies covering its administration, and approving the assignment of a newly employed kindergarten teacher. Dealing wisely with community interest or a lack of it is far more difficult on matters about which there is a community controversy than on those concerning which there is strong and united sentiment. Similarly, the enactment of a book of rules and regulations calls for a far more complex legislative procedure than would the enactment of a salary schedule, and to enact a salary schedule would be far more complex than to decide what the salary of a newly employed teacher should be.

For dealing with all problems, large or small, difficult or simple, the board is responsible and has the required authority; but it may not have the understanding. Where it lacks understanding, however, it may—and the law clearly implies that it will—turn to its expert employees, any one of whom it can call upon through its executive.

It is possible to accept the idea that the board will not act upon any matter that may have a bearing upon the operation of schools without knowing the attitude of its executive, and to accept the idea that the school executive will keep the board informed about the needs of the schools and not wait for the board to call upon him for help. The difficulty here, however, is one not of theory, but of a practical working relationship. A board can decide contrary to its executive's advice if it chooses to do so, even though it may accept his facts and reasoning on the case. On the other hand, a superintendent can present the soundest of facts and reasoning in such a manner as to evoke a negative reaction from the board.

To meet such possibilities we cannot have a superpower to judge whether either board or superintendent is functioning properly. Either of the two could function badly, either by will or from poor judgment or inadequate understanding.

The law makes it possible for each to support or to challenge the position of the other, as the case may require. Within accepted proprieties, each may defend its position openly or, if necessary, may appeal to public opinion. This should be control enough in most cases. Beyond that, there is the election that board members must face, and there is a reappointment date that the executive must face.

In dealing with cases here it will be helpful to keep in mind that on some cases action is closely shaped by law or, possibly, by board rules or case precedents, while on others it may be largely discretionary. Since the legislative process will be likely to vary with the nature of the business in hand, we may expect to find a full recognition of the above concepts when the case in hand is well covered by law and perhaps less recognition of them when action is mainly discretionary. Again, we may expect a difference in adherence to these principles when, on the one hand, the board is dealing with problems in which the right action is fairly obvious or, on the other, with problems concerning which there can be an honest difference of opinion as to the needed action. Then, problems closely related to matters previously legislated upon tend, to some extent, to have their decisions partly determined in advance. Action in anticipation of future problems is less hedged about than that on problems affecting things already accomplished, or that on business in hand. A problem with regard to which there is an active public sentiment may be handled more circumspectly by a board than one regarding which the public shows no concern. In general, the extent to which the law or board rules or previous decisions or the open nature of the problem itself or public interest or the activity of the executive tends to reveal the rightness or wrongness of board action, to that extent the board will be most likely to apply the above concepts in carrying on its work. When none of these restraints is present, it will tend to be affected by personal interests, as well.

Case 1. Preparing a book of rules. The most compre-

hensive, the most important, and the most difficult piece of legislation a board can undertake is that of setting up a code of rules for the conduct of the schools and school business. Many local boards operate without formal rules; many have rule books that are very much out of date; but increasing numbers have carefully developed codes that are revised at intervals, as circumstances and changes in the school law require. For a school system without rules the following procedure might be typical.

1. It might occur to someone that a book of rules could be helpful. This someone might be a board member disturbed by the time cost of handling so many similar cases separately, each on its merits and without reference to any principle of action; it might be a citizen or a group of citizens concerned, perhaps, because their appeal to the board had been answered in a manner inconsistent with what was believed to be established practice; or it might be the superintendent, concerned because the board wanted to settle matters that, it seemed to him, could be better handled by the administration. Having conceived the idea of the value of a book of rules, the same someone might propose that the board consider the matter. The suggestion might come to the board as a written communication or as an informal proposition presented at a board meeting.

2. The board could ignore the suggestion, but propriety would require listening to it, at least. If the board should regard the proposal as worthy of thought and ask that it be taken up for discussion, this might be done by inviting the one who suggested it to present his ideas. The board might have been impressed by two things in the proposal: as an idea for improving the school management, it sounded reasonable; since others outside had thought of it, this might be evidence that the schools needed some changes in their scheme of government. Either of these considerations would provoke thought and discussion.

3. Discussion would be expected to bring out the possible

advantages and disadvantages, would throw light upon the question of what a rule book is like, what it is for, how it can best be developed, and how it could be used. If the discussion seemed to indicate that such a project would be worth while, it might lead to a proposal that the superintendent formulate a plan for such a code, together with a plan for its development, the two to be presented at a later meeting.

4. At this point, three things would be decided: (*a*) what the book of rules would contain; (*b*) what would be the procedure in developing and using it; and (*c*) whether the board should undertake the project or not. If it were not accepted, the matter would be dropped. If it were accepted, the plan for its development would be carefully studied and finally formulated and approved by the board.

One's first thought might be that, since the rule book is a book of laws, it could be made only by a lawyer. Yet, a man trained in law could no more prepare such a code without the help of educators than he could prepare a contract for handling a complicated engineering project without the help of engineering experts. There is much more than law in the schools' rule book. The thing that is difficult is not the legal principles and processes so much as the application of these in the processes of managing the schools. For managing schools wisely the laws most difficult to apply are those of learning and of teaching, of growth and development. The laws of government are simple in comparison with laws of the mind, the emotions, the body, and social relations. The kind of knowledge that is required for the task is to be found mainly within the schools, because the plan for developing a rule book must be a plan that brings the intimate knowledge of the teacher, the principal, and the supervisor to bear upon the problems of organization and management.

The point here is that the rule book must use both authority and knowledge, applying authority in the task of management, but applying it in terms of knowledge of the

task itself. For a working plan, the superintendent would likely be free to work out a procedure in its details and to choose the staff that would develop the rules.

5. A proposal for a set of rules having been formulated, the next step would be the presentation of the rules for the board's study and deliberation. In the presentation, the superintendent would have an opportunity to focus the thought of board members upon the main purposes and the way in which each of the purposes is reflected in the organization and the content of the rules. He could indicate where authority is placed and how it flows to different parts of the system; what principles are followed in shaping the organization and the major procedures; and especially, how the rules reflect and can maintain in force the accepted philosophy and the science of education. It is in the light of this concept of rules and in these terms that the superintendent should contribute to the board's deliberations, and it is clearly his duty to see that the rules are thus understood by the board. This would be the proper function of administrative leadership.

At this stage, the question would likely be raised as to how present and past practice would fit into such a code, should the board adopt it. This should lead to a checking of the rules against past actions and probably, also, against the school laws and the state board regulations. The board might desire to hold an open hearing on the proposed rules, giving opportunity to any interested persons or groups within or outside the schools to question, criticize, or offer suggestions on the proposal.

6. With its study completed and with such changes as it desired in the light of its discussions achieved, the board would proceed to vote its approval or disapproval of the finished document. This action might require a repeal of any and all existing board rules that were in conflict with the rule book, as well as a formal adoption of the new rules.

Such action by the board would establish the responsibilities of all employees anew. It might alter programs at

some points, it might change the duties of some employees, it might alter the old routines by which the business of the schools had been transacted and, so, alter the contacts between the schools and the public. It would be necessary, therefore, for the superintendent to inform the school employees and the public of the new code. That is, the enactment of the code, which ends the legislative process, automatically sets up the administrative task of putting the code to work.

This description of the main points of a reasonably typical procedure for handling the problem shows that the legislative process may be complex in several ways. Here the problem itself is extremely broad, because such a code is to govern the board, every school employee, students, parents, all business firms that may wish to do business with the schools, and the general public, alike. Such a code establishes all the functions that combine to make up the school system; it provides machinery and the authority, not only for the government of the schools, but for carrying on all the activities required; it establishes objectives and programs; it fixes standards and procedures. All these procedures have to be consistent with law, with the aspirations of the people, and with the science and philosophy of education.

A lay board can judge whether or not it wishes to have such a code; it can judge fairly well whether any proposed set of rules would help or hinder in its work; it certainly cannot formulate the rules, since it knows the philosophy and science of education only as they are reflected in our traditions and in our culture pattern; and it previews them by such features as are readily grasped through common observation. The members of the board cannot judge how well any plan of management is likely to facilitate the tasks of learning, teaching, curriculum making, supervision, guidance, health care, and discipline for a school. The board, representing the people, must be responsible for judging

whether a proposed code sounds reasonable. Since the board governs for the people, it should not authorize any ruling until it does sound reasonable.

The division of labor here seems to be decided, not merely by the law, which places all power with the board, but very much by the nature of the task. The board—composed of all laymen—has authority. The members use their expert employees to do the technical work of forming the code, but they accept the proposals of the experts only after the experts have convinced them of the value of those proposals. Clearly, the experts have two jobs—to devise the rules and to inform and advise the board. The board's duties seem equally clear—to listen to the suggestion that they might improve the schools by having a rule book, to authorize the development of one when convinced that it could be of value, to study and finally to judge the rules proposed by their employees, and to enact the rules as law when convinced that they are in finished form.

The code is the product of legislation. In the process of its making, authority, technical knowledge, and possibly community interest were used for shaping it. The board functioned by authorizing, judging, deciding, and enacting; the employees took their part by suggesting the idea, formulating a proposed code, presenting and explaining the proposal, and recommending its adoption; the community, through individuals or groups, expressed interest, encouraged the idea, and cooperated in shaping action as requested. Legislators held and used the authority required; administrators and other experts provided knowledge and leadership; the community provided support through public discussion. Actual control of this important act of government remained with the people's representatives throughout, even though the administration may have initiated the process and developed the code. Thus, by authority, the people use expert leadership in governing themselves.

Before this case is set aside, the question may be raised

as to how leadership works with authority in legislation. Leadership can be very aggressive and insistent or very reticent and retiring. Obviously, the degree of aggressiveness used will affect results. In one case, administration might offer a suggestion and then follow through with such power of persuasion as to get approval of a proposed act before the board had had opportunity to fulfill its function of study, deliberation, and judging. In such a case, the act might be desirable yet do great harm by its having dwarfed the lay contribution to the point of its being wholly uncritical and submissive. At the opposite extreme stands the executive who will rarely make a positive proposal to his board, but who waits to be consulted. Such men are followers, not leaders. Their supposed extensive knowledge might as well not exist, since the board receives little help from it. There are many varieties of this negative type of administration. Its representatives vary in intelligence, in courage, in integrity, and in other important traits of personality. They are alike in that they are forever busy watching trends instead of trying to shape them.

What is true of the executive may be true of boards or board members. Historically, the functions now performed by school superintendents were performed mainly by school boards. These functions have been shifting slowly from the board to the superintendent. There can be no hard and fast line of cleavage that separates legislative from executive action, except at the point where the legislative action has to be performed by authority. Even that line of division is hard to find at times; for if the schools need a decision on some question of management, there is always the question of whether it is an administrative or a legislative decision that is called for. On many questions there will be a difference of opinion.

The way that the personalities of board members and superintendent get on together is likely to affect the working relationship here. A too-domineering superintendent is apt to be held in leash by the board if it is strong, while

the board will probably be dominated by him if it is weak. A domineering board may ruin an excellent leader by discouraging him from trying to lead.

The only way to find how the various players should play their parts in legislation is by making a study of the case in question; by recognizing the rights and obligations of the players to contribute, in terms of their abilities, to the solution; and by remembering that administration has only such authority as legislation has granted to it, but that its responsibility for leadership is positive and far-reaching.

Case 2. The conduct of a hearing. As a part of the process of legislation in Congress, in state legislatures, in city councils, and especially, in our many administrative tribunals, the hearing is recognized as an important feature. For school boards it is a growing feature.

Hearing, in this case, refers to a procedure by which the board grants permission to some person or group to present some matter to the board. A hearing may permit the presentation of a proposal, of suggestions, of facts, of arguments, of plans, or of requests. It may allow questions to be asked. A hearing may be conducted informally or much after the fashion of courtroom or trial procedure. The board may limit the hearing as to time, as to speakers, as to subject matter to be covered, as to what may be oral and what in writing, as to conduct of speakers and the order of procedure, or as to other matters.

The steps in a hearing before a school board might be roughly as follows:

1. Receive a request for a hearing.
2. Consider request by deliberating.
3. Grant request by a majority vote.
4. Prepare general plan for a conduct of hearing.
5. Hand plan to executive to arrange for and announce. (The board does not order, for it is the executive's business to execute acts passed by the board.)

6. Meet formally for hearing, president of board presiding unless otherwise provided.
7. President conducts meeting and enforces plans—what can and what cannot be discussed, how long speakers may have floor, interfering with speakers, presentation of certain things in writing, record of hearing, etc.
8. President adjourns meeting of hearing, but not of board.
9. Board deliberates upon results of hearing.
10. Board reaches conclusions and enacts resolutions embodying them.
11. Board hands resolution to executive for action, if any is required.

The total procedure here involves a variety of activities. In general the procedure seems to correspond very well with the six steps outlined in the previous case. Taken as a whole, the board is engaged in the study of what it believes to be a situation that may require legislation to adjust. The process of study may be more formal, perhaps more public, but as a whole these acts are legislative in purpose as well as in character and subject matter. As one notes the progress, it is apparent that the activities are under continuous control and are being directed. The control is partly through prearranged rules and plans of the board, but in part it is by direct management by the board's president—that is, control is in part by law and in part by administration (directing procedure and enforcing rules).

The fact that outsiders play a part in this type of board activity does not seem to reveal any new elements in the nature of the board's activities. The process of directing deliberations in a hearing is a bit more formal but not different in kind from that process when the board is working alone. Besides that of presiding, the administrative work in case of a hearing—such as correspondence; sending or posting notices; arranging for time, place, and facilities for

the meeting; care of records and documents—is handled by the board's executive as his part in the total of this legislative activity.[16]

Individual items of business. Turning now to legislation that is concerned with specific items of business, of which the range is very wide, let us assume that the board has a letter from a realtor offering for sale a certain piece of land for a school site and presenting evidence upon which he bases an assumption that a site is needed in that area. Procedure: Board has letter read and asks superintendent to comment; superintendent sends for copy of the building program and, turning to the area in question, states that the proposal is not wholly inconsistent with the official plans, though not in conformity, and adds that, since the land in question is less expensive than the piece called for in the building plans, it may be wise to look into the proposal. The board discusses the matter and agrees, asking how to proceed. The superintendent suggests that he have the proposed plot checked for its suitability in their long-time building program. This being an educational task, he will have it attended to if the board desires. To this the board agrees and further discussion awaits this report. The board requests the secretary to acknowledge the letter, saying that the suggestion has been referred to the superintendent and will be taken under advisement. At a subsequent meeting, and upon a favorable report, the discussion proceeds with matters of relative cost and the trend of cost for the two

[16] As a government service, education should be—and scientifically it must be—kept close to the people. Hearings are becoming common in school government and, in view of the gradual disappearance of direct legislation by the district-meeting method, they probably must be used a great deal in local-board legislation. See George E. Hale, "Administrative Hearings under the Federal Constitution." *Kentucky Law Journal,* 30:137–173, January, 1942; also the author's "School Board Procedures, with Special Reference to the Use of Hearings." *The American School Board Journal,* November and December issues of 1943 and February, April, and June issues of 1944.

sites in question. It considers whether to purchase now or to delay, and, following this, a proposal is made that a committee look into the whole question of availability and cost. For this purpose a committee is appointed by the president, to report at the next meeting.

For a different type of case the procedure would be as follows: A contractor notifies the board that a given building is completed and ready for the board's acceptance and asks for formal acceptance. The board hears the notice read; the chairman appoints a committee, including the superintendent, to inspect the building; he asks the superintendent for a full report of the technical check made by his assistant superintendent of new construction with the aid of the architect in charge and by the city fire and health departments, and he sets a date for considering these reports. In this case there are a few different contacts, but the process shows no new elements. The board seeks for information to aid in its deliberations upon a problem and, for this, calls upon its executive to perform his own proper function of aiding with the process of legislation by gathering up the reports essential to making a decision on the question in hand.

A still different problem—the consideration of the annual budget—might be a more complicated item of business and would likely include a public hearing; but again, this is a question of studying the problem, deliberating, judging as individuals what is best to do, and deciding by vote. When the superintendent presents his recommended list of teachers to be added for the year, the question is whether the budget covers this, whether the positions are available, and whether the list seems reasonable—study, deliberation, judgment, and decision, Yes or No.

On any question there is room in deliberations for objection and criticism, provided that it is used as a means of reaching a board decision. If the opportunity is used merely to punish someone, or as a means of robbing some-

one of power, or of getting some personal advantage, then it has no proper place in board work.[17] It is legitimate for a board or for any board member to criticize any proposal that the superintendent may offer, for instance, the ninth name on the list of new appointments recommended. Such criticism can ask why a certain other name is not there, instead, and can argue that the other name would be better. However, the other name is not before the board and, although it can be discussed, it cannot be voted upon unless the superintendent puts it on the list. This is because of our theory of the division of labor between board and superintendent. Selecting teachers is technical in character and is clearly an administrative act for the board's executive.

A somewhat different case would appear when a teacher claims that the principal and the superintendent have denied to him certain rights connected with his absence on account of illness. This might come to the board as an appeal by the teacher for a redress of his grievance. A hearing is held, and the superintendent presents the matter. He explains that he accepted the principal's report of the facts in the case and decided it in the light of rules, which he cites by number and quotation. After this he presents the teacher, who states his grievance. The board hears, deliberates, and decides. This procedure has all the form and earmarks of a judicial act. Yet the act included hearing or getting information, deliberation, and deciding as in legislation. The fact that it settled a dispute (as to what the facts were or what the right interpretation of the rule might be) seems to have brought very little, if anything, new into the board's activity that is not apparent in the cases above, except that the effect of the act settled a dispute instead of establishing a policy or deciding to authorize

[17] This last assertion is well enough as a hope, but consideration of how to prevent such abuses or of what would happen if legislators were not allowed very wide freedom as to their methods leaves one wondering whether such abuses are not their own best cure. Men are not angels and legislation must be not alone for, but also by, men. Read Jerome Frank, *If Men Were Angels—Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

action on some item of business. Perhaps this is not adjudication so much as it is merely answering the teacher's question as to the rightness of the superintendent's action in the case. The teacher has recourse to the court if he cares to use it. Such cases serve to illustrate how the board may, on occasion, perform acts that are to some extent judicial in character.[18]

A final case, showing more specifically how a board performs its inspectional function, may complete our list of samples of the board process. In practice this function is performed both directly—as, in inspecting a proposed school site—or incidentally, while the board is working on other matters. In any of the above cases a board can watch the superintendent at work in board meetings and judge what he knows, how he is getting on with his staff, and how he plans and directs work. One of the specific ways for a board to do this inspecting is by noting the reactions of the public to the superintendent's work, and especially through his own formal and informal reports to the board. There are the superintendent's annual reports, the yearly budgets, the agenda sheets for board meetings, many specially prepared reports, and his many formulated recommendations. From a study of these documents alone, a board could judge very well the efficiency of its superintendent and, to some extent, all the members of the central-office staff. In the case above in which the superintendent called for his building program before commenting on the realtor's proposal, one sees the best of evidence of efficiency. That superintendent knew exactly how to go to the heart of the question; he acted quickly and got his data quickly, showing that he had a good filing and record system and competent clerks. He did no dodging or guessing and showed readiness to use a suggestion that came from the outside.

Little has been said here of the board's function of in-

[18] Paul Felix Lazarsfeld, "Remarks on Administrative and Critical Communications Research." *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science,* 9:2–16, New York: Institute of Social Research, 1941. Also Earl G. Latham, "The Technique of Administrative Reporting." *Public Administration Review,* 3:10–18, Spring, 1943.

spection. The omission has been intentional, for the reason that this function is performed by a school board not as a major independent service, but primarily as a means of keeping itself informed on its problems. It is a phase of legislation, just as it is a phase of the administrative function, and as it might, in a sense, be a phase of the judicial process. Whenever a board's inspectional activities begin to function otherwise than as a means of evaluating its own past decisions as well as those of its employees, the aim being to prepare the basis for understanding and judging what future action to take, the inspection is not a board duty or a board power.

6. *Administration's Contact with the Legislative Process*

Perhaps at the expense of some repetition, an answer may be given to the question raised at the outset as to how the executive's legislative activities fit into the administrative process. If the above reasoning is sound, the relationship between legislation and administration in the government of a local school system is not a matter of power and personalities alone, but also, of principles. That the two functions must each contribute to the other, that they often go on together, and that each is a phase of the government process as a whole is clear; but that each is also independent of the other and separately responsible for a special realm of government is equally clear.

Legislation and administration must operate in harmony, because they are concerned with the same thing—education as a special service for the people. Both are responsible to the state as the source of the authority they require in their work and as the determiner of certain major purposes of education. Both have grown up as elements in our culture pattern and are means of perpetuating and of enriching or improving the substance of our culture. Further, lack of harmony between them would almost certainly defeat the purposes of both.

By their natures, however, legislation and administration

are separate and distinct functions. Legislation determines what action may be taken; administration carries out the action. Legislation makes decisions and sets them down as law; administration picks up the law for execution; with the law in hand, the administrator decides how to proceed and sets out a program and an order for his staff to follow. The legislative decision says, "This is what may be done." The administrative decision says, "This is what we shall do." Since legislative decisions must provide for all the school services, many of which are highly technical, the board must go to its experts for guidance. Also, since the school's needs can be met only if the board authorizes appropriate action, the superintendent must explain those needs to the board and request the necessary legislation. Thus each functionary must be both aggressive and receptive in his attitude toward the other. Each must hear the other, not merely because of the law, but because of the part that each must play in the other's work.

No doubt, the first superintendent was chosen to execute the board's orders rather than to advise the board what orders to formulate. As education has become more complex, however, this advisory service of the executive has grown in scope and importance. That is, in proportion as legislation has to provide for technical matters, it must provide for a way of getting the information it will need. Accordingly, the executive has had to become expert as an adviser in legislation. The board seeks information and receives it; the superintendent develops information and presents it to the board. Although we commonly think of the superintendency as an administrative office, yet, by force of the nature of its place in the government, we find it being drawn into the legislative service. Just how separate, then, can the two functions be, and how independent of each other can they operate?

This shows that, although boards are supposed to legislate and superintendents to administer, the superintendent must actually participate in legislation. Thus, the legislative proc-

ess is not carried on by the board alone. This situation is often reversed, as when the superintendent explains some problem to his board and asks for a discussion of it before he starts action upon it. Often the deliberations of the board may lead to the superintendent's changing his plan of action. In such cases, information and advice from the board influenced the administrative decision. When in these cases the final action of the board or of the superintendent is actually changed by the information or the advice and it gains by such exchanges, must we assume that the principle of separation of powers is gone, that the two functions are not separate in practice?

The legislative power and responsibility, by our laws, clearly rests with the school board.[19] The process of legislation was seen to include a number of separate forms of activity—developing information and judgment (about what the laws provide for, about what the schools need, about what the people of the community want or will sanction for their schools, about the success with which the schools are operating), deliberating upon the problems with a view to decision, making the decision, and judging the effects of the decision. To get its knowledge the board must go to the source of the knowledge it requires. By going to the best possible source, the board does not lose either responsibility or power. It is the board's business to judge when its executive has given it complete information, and it must judge how to use that information.

By this relationship the administration seems to participate in legislation in a purely impersonal way. But, is this way so impersonal in fact? It is the business of the executive, as an administrator, to plan and direct the school service. Within the laws and the board rules, he must decide what are the schools' needs and how to provide for them. As an executive, he must present these needs to the board and

[19] There are certain matters, such as issuing bonds and electing board members, upon which most states provide that power to legislate shall rest with the voters of the district. In some states this power of direct legislation by the people is very broad.

indicate what action will be required. This is not information alone; it is also advice. Back of what the superintendent advises there will be much that rests upon facts, but on most problems there will be, back of the facts, assumed values, by which the superintendent is moved. The curriculum he recommends is not only a question of facts; almost more important in his recommendation are the educational values, principles, and goals, with respect to which the facts about the curriculum are chosen.

What a superintendent may leave unsaid, what he may not advise, could be important. What he does advise might be presented with bias, with a show of sureness and of personal zeal that might be misleading. Of these matters the board must judge; surely an executive without confidence in his own program, without qualities of leadership, would be a poor alternative. We cannot escape the fact that both legislation and administration have to be carried on by men and that all men are human. Whether in a given case of such abuse the power of leadership is badly used by the superintendent or whether the power of law is sometimes badly used or neglected by the board might be hard to determine. Our plan of government established the principle of separation of powers, not to keep board and superintendent apart, but to make the use of power by either of them clearly appropriate and responsible. Certainly it was not designed to stop the flow of knowledge or the function of leadership. In the development presented in earlier chapters it was seen that the board is responsible not only for maintaining a positive program, but also for preventing interferences with that program. It must judge when its own members or its own officers are interfering.

This reasoning seems to conclude that legislative power is separate, independent, and in the hands of the board, but that knowledge to guide legislative power is as much the responsibility of the executive as of the board. It seems to conclude, also, that whoever plans, organizes, directs, coordinates, and controls the operations of the schools, by that fact must point the way for the legislation that makes those

operations possible. Legislation alone can energize administration; administration alone can inform legislation. It behooves legislation to know when, in the processes of its work, it is applying or being influenced by the power of law, the power of knowledge, and the power of public opinion or social power; and also, when it is being informed and when it is being advised or led.

In this contact of administration with legislation there appears to be a realm of administrative activity that is not a close part of, and yet not quite separate from, the processes of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling. All the matters presented to the board for action or decision are matters that pertain to, or that have grown out of, one or another of these five areas of administration. Yet, the process of presenting them to the board is itself distinctive in character. If it is not quite distinctive in content, it is carried on with regard to a distinctive purpose; for it is seeking authority to act, as distinguished from acting. Further, it is carried on by a distinctive method, the method of legislation. This assistance to the board is much like planning, but it functions as a helper and without power to complete or conclude the board process. In many respects, also, it reflects characteristics of the other forms of the administrative process.

To treat this area as a sixth division of the administrative process would find justification in the purpose and in the nature of the process, perhaps, but not so much in the content with which it would deal. Also, such a separation might have the disadvantage of emphasizing a cleavage in the work of the executive between his working with the board and his working with his professional staff on the same problems. To bring the legislative and administrative processes close together, by thinking of this field as a phase of the other administrative activities, rather than as an independent area, seems wiser, since an executive's work with his board is and must be the growing edge of his work with his staff.

Part III

The Subject Matter of Public School Administration—Its Nature and Sources

Chapter 12. OUR APPROACH TO A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF SUBJECT MATTER

This chapter opens a third approach to the study of the nature of the administrative process. Part I analyzed and described the process as it is observed in operation; Part II analyzed the powers that are used to initiate and energize the process; Part III examines more intimately one of the forms of power revealed in Part II, *viz.*, that of knowledge. This study becomes necessary because, as already has been shown, knowledge is in fact a part of the process; but there is also the practical reason that today one can enter the administrative profession only by giving evidence of possessing extensive knowledge of what has come to be recognized as the subject matter of the field. It is a fair certainty that what one learns will somehow help to shape what he will do later as an administrator. Thus the choice of subject matter for the field becomes a factor in determining the nature of the process.

This study presents three main problems: (1) What is the nature of this subject matter and from what sources may we obtain it? (2) by what reasoning may one choose material from each of the several sources? and (3) In view of our unsolved problems and of present trends, what work lies ahead for the student of this field?

The present chapter is concerned with the first of these problems. It is a search for the sources from which an appropriate subject matter may be obtained. Past experience is reviewed to see how present available subject matter has

come to be what it is. This reveals only a little of what we may accept as sound scientific or philosophical study of the problem so far; mainly we have studied and tried to explain practice as it is carried on.

Following this historical review of experience, inquiry is made into the factors that are indirectly, as well as directly, involved in practice, the aim being to throw light upon those elements with respect to which one must have knowledge, skill, and an understanding attitude, if he is to act wisely in a situation. This provided certain fairly well-defined bases, with reference to which one might recognize appropriate materials.

With a point of view with reference to the essential values in the field of administration established, the inquiry proceeds to search for the sources to which one must go—sources from which the knowledge of essentials; the attitudes and skills and personal traits required; and the proper obligations to state, to society, to community, and to school may be understood. Besides the facts of administrative practice itself, this points to a wide range of fields among the social and psychological sciences and reveals how the science and philosophy of administration are related to those fields.

This study of the sources of our subject matter is followed by a brief consideration of a method of approach for the choice and organization of the materials.

1. *The Study of Subject Matter an Essential Part of an Inquiry into the Nature of the Administrative Process*[1]

Knowledge does not function by itself. The function of knowledge as an element in the administrative process has been discussed at length in previous chapters. Knowledge was shown to be one of the four forms of power that, together, energize and direct the process. These four de-

[1] The author's "A Program of Instruction for School Administrators." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 35:129–149, March, 1949.

terminers—law, knowledge, social norms and standards, and personality traits—set the machinery of administration in motion, give it direction, speed it up or slow it down, and halt it.

Law is developed consciously; so it represents knowledge trying to anticipate what needs are to be met and what forms of activity may be required. But law is more than this, for it embodies the power of the state to compel the actions that it prescribes. Although knowledge lacks any physical power to compel, it is equal to law in its power to persuade action by force of fact and reason. Knowledge differs also from social power—custom, tradition, public opinion—because it appeals to reason and understanding, whereas tradition appeals only to the sense of personal fitness and social acceptability. Where the force of law operates, knowledge can operate only to set the law going and to facilitate the action of the legal power. Since by the nature of things, law must provide often for discretion, it is clear that we count on knowledge to do some things which law cannot do. Thus, we assume that the power of law will be supplemented by the power of reason and fact.

Knowledge cannot defy the effects of the power of the law on the accepted way of life (the culture pattern) of the people. Further, knowledge has to be developed and put to work by people. For putting knowledge to work, the force of personality becomes important. Often it is not what one is directed to do but the manner of directing that determines what the response will be. Human relationships are endlessly involved in administration, which is concerned with many people and with questions of great and small import, when harmony or friction in the work may result primarily because personalities come together in one case gracefully or, in another, in discord.

These several forms of energy are separate but not wholly independent of one another. Knowledge is, in a sense, objective and impersonal. Yet, the law is likely to have wide influence upon where and how knowledge may work in ad-

ministration. Since knowledge is assembled and used by people and is for use in a service that is conducted for the people, it is clear that what knowledge does will be colored by the requirements of the prevailing culture pattern and by the character, ability, and personality of the one who develops and applies it to the service. Thus, as forms of energy, these four elements are as important for being united to supplement each other as for the capacity of each to contribute a special kind of power.

Knowledge as facts and as subject matter—two problems. Our concern here is with knowledge both because it is involved as an element in administration and because one has to learn how to administer—how to get together the knowledge that is essential to an understanding of school administration. What knowledge do we need? Where and how can it be obtained? By what criteria may one judge facts, concepts, and principles to be useful? Knowledge of administration must cover a wide range if it is to explain all that is required for developing and directing a school system. Along with facts and principles, the administrator will require many skills, cultivated tastes, a personality suited to the task, and an outlook upon life and upon education that rests upon values that society regards as essential starting points for the public school enterprise.

The subject matter of this field must include much more than bare facts; therefore, even though other types of learning required—such as learning skills, developing personality, learning to reason, learning to judge the implications of basic values as guides to action—may seldom be called for except in reference to some kind of facts.

Various approaches to any search for the subject matter of this field readily suggest themselves. The first and most obvious would be to take account of what we are now using as subject matter and, especially, of any systematic studies that have attempted to discover what subject matter is required or to outline a plan for developing a suitable subject matter, or to establish criteria for choosing what to include.

Some of the practical aspects of these problems were discussed by educators as early as 1910, and many such matters have been re-examined more recently. Quite naturally, because of the pressing demand, emphasis has been put upon the question of what to teach and how to arrange and present the materials to classes. The basic reasons for our choice of materials and of procedures have not been entirely ignored, but so far, no effort seems to have been made to put the subject matter of this field upon a well-reasoned foundation of theory. We have developed an extensive body of subject matter, have arranged it in textbook form, and then have left it to justify itself if it could. The belief of the writer is that we have a valuable collection of materials, but that these materials would be of still greater value if we could show why and how they really cover the field or wherein they fail to cover it.

However obvious the present foundations of this field of study may seem in their essential aspects (its connections with political science and with the science of education, for instance), sound scholarship requires of a subject, or of a branch or field of study, that the materials of its subject matter shall be essential, complete, consistent, unified, and useful as an explanation of any subject, branch, or field to which it applies. In school administration, it is not enough to know practice as it is. By teaching practice as it is we would be assuming that what we have is what it is desirable to have. This might or might not be true. Neither is it enough to deal in generalities or to guess at the reason for practice. It is obvious that an administrator needs to know education, that he needs to know our government; but the important questions are how a knowledge of education functions as part of the knowledge of administration and what—out of the vast field of knowledge about education—the administrator requires in order to know his own field.

Anyone who tries to answer these questions for all the things that a school administrator needs to know and for the many skills that his work requires, would find himself ranging far away and into many fields of scholarship.

Writers in the field have been conscious of these contacts, as is apparent from most of the recent textbooks on the subject; but as one looks through university requirements for advanced degrees in this field of study, he is forced to conclude that, so far, we have no very clear picture of what the school administrator needs from the various fields outside that of school administration.

The subject matter of any field is built up slowly at best. Perhaps for most subjects it can never be entirely complete, for there is ever something more to learn. For any subject in the field of the social sciences account has to be taken of social change, so the subject matter for such fields must be thought of as less stable than the subject matter in the field of the physical sciences. This would not be true of all the facts of a social-science study, but it would be true of many of them. When education sets up new ends to be served, as it is constantly doing; or when the size of the schools changes; or when, by invention and discovery, new ways of housing and living together have been developed, the management will need to discard some of the old aims and processes and to develop new ones. Thus, in developing the subject matter of school administration, one not only is concerned to find the new facts and principles that are needed, but has constantly to deal with obsolescence of materials that have hitherto been useful.

It is not necessary to try here to prove that administration or any other part of the field of education is now developed into a science or that it can be. That school administration is a rational process, that it is based upon facts as well as upon philosophy is too obvious. The fact that administration is carried out by man, man who acts by whim as well as by reason, does not alter this.[2] It is the task of research and experience in this field to find out how so to shape administration that whim may be held to account. To curb whim without curbing originality and initiative is not simple,

[2] See C. H. Garland, "Some Reflections on Administration." *Public Administration,* 7:43–50, January, 1929.

but to say that such problems cannot be scientifically studied is to give up too easily. Further, no subject ever began as a science. It requires long and careful study to construct a science from what one learns about a field of interest.

School administration is related in many ways to public administration, a field that has been studied for centuries. School administration became a special subject of study in this country some fifty years ago, not so much because men were intellectually curious about its problems as that our school districts were in urgent need of intelligent leadership for their schools. During this time, a large literature on the subject has been developed, the need for trained men in the field has grown apace, administrative practice has undergone extensive changes. These are good reasons why we may hope to profit by trying to take stock of where we stand in the development of a suitable subject matter for this field.

Early attempts at developing subject matter for this field. In any social study, the past is usually important as an explanation of the present and, often, as an index to the future. To be able to evaluate what we now have as the subject matter of school administration, to develop criteria by which one may make a wise choice of subject materials, and to identify and locate the sources from which appropriate materials may be found, we should be familiar with the way in which school administration came to be what it is in practice and in the life and interests of the people, how the subject gained its present position as a university discipline, and what thought we have so far given to the task of developing an appropriate subject matter.[3] A few of the high lights of this development should serve at least to remind us of the

[3] From the bibliography at the end of this study it will be apparent that there has been much interest in the possibilities of developing a science of administration. The materials of such a science would obviously become essential as subject matter. See Herbert A. Simon, "A Comment on the Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 7:200–203, Summer, 1947.

importance of the historical approach to this subject, and they may, perhaps, reveal how little our studies, to date, have to offer on some phases of the problem of what is the nature of the subject matter of public school administration.

Little research is required to show that, as a subject, school administration in this country has grown up in the face of many difficulties. The function itself came to exist in a substantial way in practice only as our population centers grew and schools began to be arranged as school systems. Education itself was undergoing great change, late last century, and still is. Because our schools increased rapidly in size and numbers throughout the country in the eighties and nineties, their cost soon reached a point where the people began to ask why and to demand more efficient management. School administration was a crude practice, of course, long before we had begun to sense the possibility of its being a science or felt the need for a subject or a university discipline by that name.

Thought of in rough terms, school administration is an old calling and, even as a somewhat technical occupation, it dates back hardly a century in this country.[4] As a subject, a field of scientific study, a university discipline, however, its beginnings lie practically within the present century. Some administrative matters were treated, rather casually, in the early books on supervision and classroom management.[5]

With the growth of schools and of school systems, as well as of school sentiment, toward the end of last century, however, the problems of administration began to press for atten-

[4] The National Association of School Superintendents, now the American Association of School Administrators, was established in 1865.

[5] William H. Payne, *School Supervision.* New York: American Book Company, 1876; John Gill, *School Management.* Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co., 1880; Amos M. Kellog, *School Management.* New York: E. L. Kellogg & Company, Copyright 1884; Joseph M. Baldwin, *The Art of School Management.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1889; and Albert N. Raub, *School Management.* Lockhaven, Pa., 1882. These are fair examples.

tion, especially in our growing cities. For use at the Paris Exposition in 1900, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler assembled a wealth of material describing America's plan of education and explaining the nature and purposes of our schools.[6] In this collection, Dr. A. S. Draper's treatment of "Educational Organization and Administration" foreshadowed in outline much of what was soon to become a substantial body of fact and principles pertaining to this field. Even before that, looking back from the present, signs of the development of the new profession and new science can be seen in the 248-page report of a study of Chicago's schools, published in 1899,[7] and in the appearance of a few doctors' theses in this field,[8] and in a number of articles and addresses on the problems of the school superintendency.[9]

With the opening of the new century, all these beginnings developed rapidly, as one can see by consulting the volumes of proceedings of the National Education Association; the pages of such journals as *Educational Review, The American School Board Journal,* and *School Review;* the official reports of state and local school officers; and, finally, the new books directly on the subject by William E. Chancellor, Samuel T. Dutton, and David Snedden. Of these books one is bound to say that their authors had found an abundance of subject matter which was obviously pertinent to this rapidly developing new function in the public schools, and that they had put it together in excellent form for classroom use. It was equally clear that these three men had more than a haphazard notion of what this function was in practice at the time, and also of the principles that must be in-

[6] Nicholas Murray Butler, *Education in the United States.* Albany: J. B. Lyon Company, 1900.

[7] Commission, *Report of the Educational Commission of Chicago, Illinois,* 1889. Reprinted by the University of Chicago Press.

[8] William C. Webster, *Recent Centralizing Tendencies in State Educational Administration.* Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Vol. VIII, No. 2, New York, 1897.

[9] J. M. Greenwood, "The Superintendent and the Board of Education." *Educational Review,* 18:363–377, November, 1899.

troduced if it were to render effective service as a part of a unified system of government for public education. Much of the content of these books is as sound now as it was then, which is merely noting that here, as in all sciences, many of the facts and parts of their organizations are obvious and unchanging. But these books faced a situation quite different from the present. Today the function of administration not only is more clearly defined in theory, but is quite generally and uniformly established in practice. At that time, much of the administrative function was still in the hands of the lay boards of education, and the task of the school executive was not so much to administer as to get the board to permit him to administer.

At the outset, the problem must have seemed less a question of basic theory than of directly practical procedure; it was an explanation of how to organize and manage a system of schools that was needed. Yet, any study leading to such an explanation would of necessity make choice of ends to be worked for and would describe the procedures for attaining those ends. Incidental to this, a discussion of the merits of the proposed objectives and of the plans and processes for attaining them could hardly avoid the philosophical question of ultimate values or that of the possible use of principles to guide action amidst such a miscellany of activities as must have been faced. The fact that we set out to find answers to practical problems and, in our search, developed a need for a science and a philosophy of administration was due simply to the fact that administration was becoming a big and important activity, which by its nature could be made rational all the way from its purpose through its structure and procedures to its end product.

The activity of directing men on a large scale, and of handling materials and tools in terms of prearranged purposes and plans must have provoked serious thought throughout the ages. Building pyramids, temples, palaces, forts, roads, and ships; draining swamps; marshalling armies; conducting the affairs of tribe or state—these pursuits remind

us that administration has been as much a fact of life as has society itself. We build sciences about objects and forms of energy in nature that we wish to understand and use—plants, animals, minerals, light, sound, electricity, the weather—no one of which presents problems more immediately pressing upon us, perhaps, than do those pertaining to the governing of ourselves and the management of our affairs as we live and work together. So, why not have a science of administration?[10]

Government as law making is a very old subject, but the branch called public administration and the branch called administrative law, as distinct fields, are of relatively recent development. School administration is a bit newer still.

Whether more of our subjects—sciences and arts, alike—have got their start from pure intellectual curiosity or desire for self-expression, on the one hand, or from the urgent need of information to guide our actions in practical matters, on the other, it might be difficult to say. At any rate, for administration, whether of law, of state, of business, of religion, or of schools, it seems likely that need for practical information must have been the starting point, however much intellectual curiosity may have added as its development went on.

Early teaching of school administration. Judging from our catalogue announcements of courses, our professional schools offered instruction on some administrative matters, along with courses on methods and management, long before they undertook to single out administrative matters for treatment in separate courses. For 1894 to 1895, Teachers College, Columbia University, announced a course—Pedagogy XV—which included only administrative problems:

[10] See an illuminating article on the order of development of our sciences, entitled "Stars, Proteins, and Nations," by Philippe Le Corbeiller, in *The Atlantic Monthly,* 178:78–83, December, 1946; also, Ralph W. Gerard, "The Scope of Science." *The Scientific Monthly,* 44:496–512, June, 1947.

and in the year following, their course announcement showed a *department of school supervision and law,* in which the "major course" covered the duties of school principal and school superintendent. In 1897 to 1898, Dr. Cubberley, at Stanford University, offered a course called "Organization and Supervision of School Systems," for "principals and superintendents," and a "seminar in the statistical study of school systems." In the year following, he offered a "seminar in administrative problems." Other universities followed. In 1902 to 1903, Chicago University announced a course with the title, "Administration of Public Education in the United States with special reference to State control." In 1903 to 1904, Michigan University offered a two-hour course called "Superintendent's Round Table," which was concerned mainly, but not solely, with administration; but in their announcement for the year following, a course appeared with the title, "School Administration."

These samples illustrate how in our universities the subject matter of school administration came into existence, and one can see how substantially the Chancellor books and the Dutton and Snedden book must have contributed toward laying the foundation for what we now have as organized material on the subject.

That serious thought was being given to the question of a suitable subject matter for courses in administration was apparent in the fact that in 1910 the meeting of the National Society of College Teachers of Education was devoted to a consideration of this problem. The discussion covered the aims and methods, as well as the scope, of a course in public school administration.[11] For the time it was written—and parts of it for any time—this discussion was excellent from the standpoint of *what* to use for subject matter, and it was not completely lacking in consideration of the criteria by

[11] Frank E. Spaulding, William Paxton Burris, and Edward C. Elliott, *The Aims, Scope, and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration.* The National Society of College Teachers of Education, 1910.

which items of subject matter should be included. There seemed to be an intention to turn out students who would have extensive *knowledge* of the nature and place and also of the possibilities, of free schools in our country; to have the student know the schools and the practical limiting conditions and circumstances within which the schools must work. But beyond this wide knowledge, there was recognized the need for men with skill in dealing with people—positive, aggressive, determined men, with ideals and the power of leadership. Though all this discussion was in general terms, it had the merit of pointing out what has since become the line of development.

Since that first attempt to examine the question of what one should study in order to fit himself for work in school administration, there have been substantial developments. Many textbooks have appeared on the subject,[12] extensive researches on special problems have been reported, a large general literature has developed, and the place of school administration in the curriculums of institutions of higher learning has been universally recognized. Nor was this all. Parallel and related to these developments, certain outside demands were put upon the teachers and writers in this field. The school survey movement began in 1910 and, along with it, the testing movement, the playground movement, the school-hygiene movement; and all drew heavily upon the leadership of the field of school administration.

Pressure for a practical, rather than scientific, viewpoint. In all these developments the demand for action and decision was everywhere urgent. Students wanted to learn the subject. For them this meant one thing—how to run a school system. Courses had to be organized and textbooks prepared. In a school survey one was obligated to show wherein the schools were good or poor and what to do next. At every turn the leadership had to face immediate practical needs, needs very close to actual school problems. The

[12] William E. Chancellor, *Our Schools—Their Administration and Supervision.* Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1904.

fact that all these demands came at a time when there were few trained leaders was fortunate, in that they provided laboratories and endless material for study. Certainly the outcome has been fortunate, for it has produced an extensive and somewhat systematized body of knowledge about education and the way to manage it.

Work carried on under such pressure was better calculated to produce competent practice in the form of techniques and patterns of procedure that would work than it was to produce a science or a philosophy of administration. It was likely to produce extensive knowledge of school practice, but knowledge that was based upon a close-up view. Naturally, our first subject matter for the field was made up largely of recounted experiences and personal opinions.[13] Then came the period of scientific study, which at the beginning was very short on scientific method and almost equally short on data. In these beginning stages we were less concerned with ultimate values than with guiding recipes for action. For many years, we taught and wrote descriptions and explanations of patterns and techniques, of "how to administer." More recently, attention has been turning away from a mere "knowledge of how to get on in practice" to a "knowledge of how to find out how to get on right," as the aim of our teaching in this field. This reveals the beginning of an attack upon the foundations, as well as upon the superstructure, of administrative practice.

The Spaulding report of 1910 must have influenced the teaching and the early textbook work in this field. The report's proposals seemed to express what the profession felt about the subject. Had the demand for practical knowledge been less urgent, one might have expected this report to be followed by others dealing more concretely with some of its general proposals about what kinds of knowledge an administrator needs. Individuals were piling up facts and more facts into textbooks on school administration, each

[13] A glance at the older books on school management shows this clearly. They represent observation and experience, but little in the way of scientific study.

writer choosing in terms of his own conception of what would be useful as subject matter. The general idea seemed to be that the subject matter was to be gathered by assembling facts and principles, if any were found, about actual management of schools. These materials were to be sought by a study of practice. A present view would be that certainly such a study is the place to start but hardly the place to end a search for the proper subject matter for this field.

In the literature following 1910, one finds volumes of material on school administration. Added up, it provides much that is clearly pertinent. It reveals study of school laws and of the place of the government in our plan of education. It shows that administrators were thinking much of education (teaching, learning, curriculum work, supervision, research, health and personnel work), also, of the new subject of educational sociology; and a few saw value in the history and philosophy of education. Even with these developments, administrative practice tended still to hold to the idea that administration was a field apart, a practice that had its own principles and that relied on its own routines and methods.

Later studies. The fact that, for a number of years, one finds no further reports or discussion devoted specifically to the question of an appropriate subject matter for this field does not mean that the problem was forgotten. Surely it was not. In the textbooks on the subject there is clear evidence that the question was under constant study. When, in the late thirties, the question began to receive attention, it is not strange that mere speculation should have been replaced by studies of what our experiences had been —what we had learned so far—and of what people of training and experience in the field thought we should be using as subject matter.[14]

[14] A number of studies are worthy of listing here. Together they include most of the more direct attempts to deal with the problem under discussion.

Clarence Carl Moore, "The Educational Administrator and his

In 1937 Moore published the first installment of findings from his doctor's dissertation, in which he made a study of courses offered in higher institutions on this subject, of laws and state-department requirements for certification, and of what training in this field superintendents had received. Lund's study covered a somewhat wider sample of experience and was of value in that it brought together the views of those who were teaching and writing in this field.

When added up, these surveys of experience were extremely valuable as a means of making available the best ideas and fairly complete information as to what was being taught and how much special training our administrators were receiving. It was all, however, in very general terms. One may know the titles of courses offered, the large topics covered, the number of units of work required for majoring in administration, the number and names of courses to be covered, and the experience required for certification, and still have no real basis for a theory by which to prepare the appropriate subject matter for the field. Such information may be useful in revealing what is *possible,* but it is no sure index to what is *good.* For this, a basis for determining the degree of goodness must be found in a sound philosophy of school administration.

It is as reasonable to ask how one can have a philosophy

Opportunities." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 23:622–632, November, 1937; "The Superintendent's Professional Background." *School Executive,* 60:26–27, January, 1941; "Superintendents' Certificates." *Nation's Schools,* 27:49–50, February, 1941; "Majors and Minors for Superintendents." *School Executive,* 60:17, March, 1941; "The College Offering in School Administration." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 27:617–622, November, 1941. Also, American Association of School Administrators, *Standards for Superintendents of Schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1939. Also, Walter D. Cocking and Kenneth R. Williams, *The Education of School Administrators.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940. Also, John Lund, *Education of School Administrators.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, *Bulletin* 6, 1941.

of school administration without knowing the subject as it is to ask how he can know the subject without having a philosophy of it. The truth is, the two must evolve together, as they have been doing. We think of something to try, we try it; then, by reflecting upon it, we choose what to try or not to try again. Often, too, the reflecting reveals new things to try—perhaps, whole new fields to explore. To reflect is to work with concepts, ideas, and facts; to reason; to imagine; to guess. Administrators and teachers and students of the subject, alike, have had to work so much with facts and with actual tasks that there was little time to deal with abstractions. The real has pressed so hard upon us that the ideal has been pushed aside. Thus, the subject matter we have built up consists more of recipes, directions, patterns, and gadgets than of the reasoning upon which these things rest.

Trends away from mechanical toward functional approach. Of late there are signs of a shift in emphasis—from administration as mechanism to administration as purpose and process or as function; from administration as an independent realm to administration as an aspect or phase of a total unified social process; from stress upon the how to stress upon the why of management; from stress upon power to stress upon responsibility and opportunity. This is noticeable in several recent textbooks; in a number of general treatises; and in numerous reports, yearbooks, and articles. The discussions of democracy in administration and of the nature and place of general education in its relation to professional education, the recent new stressing of the position of humanistic studies and of the place of the Federal government in education, to say nothing of the studies of professional education in other fields—all these developments have clear implications for the study of school administration, implications that point to deeper meanings and far wider reaches into other realms of knowledge than are apparent from any study of the immediate mechanism or methods of administrative practice.

This hasty sketch may serve as a rough account of how the subject matter of this field stands after a half century of experience and study. It appears that we have begun to reflect upon our experience, that we have taken some preliminary steps toward the development of a science and some more modest steps, perhaps, toward developing a theory of administration. It seems now that we should undertake a next forward step by trying to show concretely what we mean when we say that a school administrator should know government, sociology, education, psychology, and many other things. How and why does the practice of administration require these knowledges? What, in each of such fields, must an administrator know in order to understand his own problems as a manager?

If we begin such an inquiry by asking what concepts, facts, ideas, and principles we need in order to understand and to perform the tasks of administration, we shall have to have some idea of what the administrative work is and some idea, perhaps, of what it ought to be. We may safely assume that our knowledge of this is still incomplete—partly, because we know that education (along with all of social life) is continuously changing. This need not interfere, except to warn us that our conclusions must be regarded as in some measure tentative. This means that we shall be searching for the right subject matter of a field the nature and boundaries of which we do not fully know. That is, we shall hope to learn more about the subject, as well as more about the subject matter by which one may teach or learn the subject.

At least we know much about the education process and the schools that are to be administered. We know that the general purposes and plans for education are set out in laws that create the schools. We know that the schools are very intimately a part of the community and of the government. We know that the customs, traditions, proprieties, and aspirations of the people tie the school into the social past and give it direction toward a social future; and we know that

we shall be using the existing culture pattern, while trying to improve it for the generation growing up.

It is in these ways that an inquiry into the nature of the subject matter for school administration can get its start from very definite, quite obviously essential facts about the nature of its job.

2. *Bases for Choosing Subject Matter*

The science and the subject matter of administration not identical. In selecting materials for use as subject matter here, as in any field, we are compelled to think of the learner and of the activities of the learner, as well as of the things to be learned. And of things to be learned we must think not of facts and principles alone, but also of other things to be acquired—tastes; interests; attitudes; habits; social skills; physical coordinations; and the techniques of sound reasoning, judging, imagining, willing, and the like. This use of the term subject matter stresses the idea that education is concerned not merely with accumulating knowledges and skills, but also with acquiring understanding, will, and readiness as to the use of them when and where they are needed. It is not enough merely to know; so, with additions to one's knowledge there must go changes in his personality—increase in capacity to appreciate, to judge, to strive, to decide, to make one's influence felt by others. This applies especially in administration and in most of the social sciences, but quite differently, perhaps, to physical sciences, wherein the end sought is "knowledge, or knowledge to use in a search for more knowledge," and not "knowledge to use in instructing, dealing with, or governing others."

When we speak of a subject here, we have in mind something slightly different from what we mean when speaking of a science. A science is a body of systematically arranged facts and principles that are so bound together by logic as to make a unity of meanings throughout, all in terms of values that are uniformly accepted as such. As soon as one

starts to teach or to study a science, however, he must think of its purposes, of how best to teach it, and of how best to learn it. It is not enough merely to know facts and principles, with their neat logic of arrangement and ultimate values. The final concern must be with what happens to the learner—what he will be like and how he will behave when he has learned the science. The subject matter for school administration would include the science of administration, but beyond this, it would include many activities, since one learns skills mainly by practicing them and develops personality and character by developing desires, attitudes, aspirations, and will to achieve, which can come only through actual experience.

In administration one is controlled and otherwise limited in many ways by laws, customs, and public opinion, but never completely so. Outside these controls there is wide room for choice of decision or action. Within this realm of free action there is ample room to perform, either so badly as to void the good effect of the controls under which one's freedom of choice is made available to him, or so well that he will be hailed as a great leader. Clearly, then, to learn administration one will need to go beyond a memorization of the bare facts of the science. He will need to be a scientist, so that he may have capacity to apply his methods and facts and principles to the concrete realities of life in his job. To do this, however, he will need many skills and should have a physique and a personality that will enable him to work with his people in such a way as to bring the force of the public will into its proper place in the building of school policies and in understanding and using what the schools have to offer.[15]

[15] In a democracy the people must participate in the development of the laws and public policies and in the execution of them. The representatives of the people in charge of the government must be kept sensitive to this influence. Discretion of an officer is always under the law and is equally under public opinion and the accepted social standards and traditions. It is the function of administration to see to it that the people do contribute to school policies and that they sense them as their own.

Here, then, in *the demands of the job,* we have one basis —very broad and complex, perhaps, but no less real for the choice of the subject matter of school administration. It calls for knowledge about the job and for the personality and character traits required to apply the knowledge when and as it is needed in the job. The way scientific knowledge can be applied to these ends must help to guide us, therefore, in our choice of what items of it to use in training administrators. So, it is not merely in the knowledge about the job, but in the building of a special kind of self, as well, that we find the objectives of subject matter for this field.[16]

Contrasting concepts of administration affect the choice of subject matter. At first thought, one wonders how there could be any other basis than this for the selection of subject matter. If it is assumed that the nature of the task dictates how the task is to be performed, then clearly the method of performance would be derived from a study of the job. But it obviously matters, also, who the performer is. Therefore, to a study of education (service to be administered) there must be added study of actual performance (wherein ability of performers is applied to the administrative work to be done). That is, "requirements of the job" has reference to two things: the capacity of the administrator (his skills, knowledge, personality) and the work (planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling the school service). When we say that our subject matter for administration is derived from the nature of the job, we mean that, by a study of the nature of the school service and of

[16] We may distinguish between administration as a highly responsible profession, on the one hand, and as a mere trade or high-class clerkship, on the other. As the administrative work of the schools or of any other government service or of a business is now organized, there is a wide range of jobs—some, extremely minor ones, with narrow and almost completely routine assignments; others, highly responsible, with extensive discretionary powers. Obviously, the knowledge and skill and personality traits required for these positions can vary greatly and still be suitable in each case if the personnel is appropriately assigned. Here we shall have in mind the appropriateness, as well as the extent, of the specific items of subject matter.

the nature of the administrator's activities and capacity to perform such service, we can find the facts and principles about administration that we should teach and the activities by which the necessary attitudes, skills, and personality traits can best be developed.

As an alternative to this assumption (that the nature of administration is derived from a study of the work to be done) suppose that one accepted the proposition that administration is a thing in itself, quite independent, outside of and apart from the service administered; that it has laws (of organization, direction, coordination) that are derived from a study of man's powers (legal, intellectual, social, physical) to imagine and to manipulate personnel, materials, ideas, facts, and guesses, about anything whatever that needs to be managed. Then to learn administration one would study the body of facts and principles that had been thus developed about administration, and not the job, not education. Having mastered his science or art of administration, as such, as a set of techniques and rules, he would be armed equally well for managing a school, a railroad, a prison, an army, or an evening reception.

Both of these approaches would use knowledge, both would use authority, both would use the accepted social standards and techniques; but they would interpret the nature of these three elements differently and would stress them differently. For instance, the former view would say that authority exists not merely as an expression of the state, or of sovereignty, but as a means of accomplishing work that the people want done. The state has many kinds of work to do. One of them is to maintain schools. Exponents of the former view would say that authority to run schools is specific, in the sense that it was designed to fit the particular needs of the schools. That is, it was formed solely as a means and has no existence as a thing in itself, independent of the schools or independent, even, of the particular purposes and processes stated in the law that created it—or if not stated, then implicit in the nature of the

task to which it is applied.[17] Thus, by this view of administration, authority is created by the state but is formed in terms of what science reveals about the nature of the work to be done. It would insist that authority cannot defy the dictates of science, that there is nothing in the law that permits it to ignore the laws of learning, the laws of health, the principles of safety and the care of children, or the social and moral standards and practices of society.

By this view, the actual direction and control of schools is as much subject to the dictates of science and of the cultural mechanism (standards and forms of behavior, as, manners, forms of speech, customs, proprieties, morals, public opinion, professional ethics) as it is to the force of the law. This is true because the law itself was formed in the light of what science and the social standards indicated as necessary to a proper management of the schools. So, it appears that discretionary power in administration is, after all, not personal authority; it is not fancy free, but free only within limits fixed by the application of science and of social standards in the situation. It might be that an executive could defy science and enforce procedures that were educationally unsound. This would be quite possible if the dictates of science in the case were complicated and little known, but if the health or safety of the children were involved, wherein his defiance of science must be evident to all, he would be likely to be called to account. If he succeeded in defying science, that would not be administration but only the misuse or the abuse of it.

Space would not be taken here to discuss this personal-dictatorship concept of administration, were it not so often practiced and, now, in principle and practice, so rampant in world affairs. Probably it will forever be a part of the daily task of men to fight such abuse. Of all people in the world, educators should be clearheaded as to the nature of

[17] School law is thus interpreted in our courts. See *Bohn v. Stubblefield*, 238 Ill. A. 453; also *Short-Conrad Co. v. San Claire School District*, 94 Wis. 535, 69 N.W. 337.

this task. Dictators can be benevolent, they can use science and social standards to guide their ordering; but implicit in their scheme is the concept that science and social standards are not compelling if they, the dictators, choose to set them aside. With the dictator, as we have seen, administration is essentially an art. It can be a barbarous art, as free to use deceit and murder as to employ science and ethics for attaining its ends. We see no such hideous forms of it in education, but our concern here is with the principle—that authority is the all in all and is granted to the person as his own, for him to use. Back of this is the "I am the state" idea of government. Machiavelli's advice to a prince makes the principle very clear by showing how it can be applied in its most revolting forms.

The point here is that, when one accepts the authority of an office as a grant of power to himself personally, he is assuming this authority to be superior to science and ethics and is claiming that he is free to use it for personal ends. From this it follows that administration is a personal matter, that the forming of any rules or principles to guide it is his own concern and that any such rules must arise out of his will, not necessarily from the nature of the job.

If this discussion has served to bring to mind the two opposing ways of viewing the administrative process, it must be clear that subject matter chosen for instruction in terms of one of these views would be little likely to serve, should the other view be desired. For the further purposes of this study it will be assumed that the nature of the administrative process derives from the nature of the service to be rendered —the service being viewed as the schools to be developed and operated, including the activities essential to their operation, and the nature of the administrator, of the society served, and of the people who do the work. A further assumption, which follows from this, will be that the energizing power of administration includes not only the authority of law, but also the authority of science and the authority of social and professional standards, each operating in its

own realm.[18] It will be assumed that these three forms of authority are intended by the people to operate in harmony —that school law is intended to instrument, never to defy, either science or ethical standards. It will be assumed that the three forms of power are assigned to the office, not to the person, of the administrator, and that the administrator is at once subject to and responsible for their application, at places, at times, by methods, and to ends, all inherent in the nature of education as a function of the state—our state. This is saying that our public schools are, in fact, a part of the state—the state, not as a plan merely, but as a reality, a going concern—and that the social and political concepts that provide the foundations of the state provide, besides, the foundations of education as a function of the state.

As for the other approach, we cannot wisely allow our young student to grow up ignorant of its appeals to men. No one can set aside lightly its claims to some basis in the nature of man and of societies or its claims of efficiency. But believing still more in the claims of democracy, and having accepted that as our starting point, we should hold strictly to our chosen course. In holding to that course, however, we must not close our eyes, either to the fact that the authoritarian view makes a strong appeal, especially to weak administrators and to domineering men everywhere, or to the fact that it will almost surely be present as an opposition force and that its approach is often insidious rather than open and rational. Accordingly, acceptance of the idea that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the service it manages must carry with it the additional idea that whoever operates in terms of that idea will have constantly to provide against the encroachments of the dictator concept. The implication here is that the subject matter of administration must take account not only of

[18] Woodrow Wilson, in "The Study of Administration" (*The American Political Science Review,* 31:28, 1937), said, "The Principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart."

all that combines to make up the job, but also of any and all things, forces, circumstances, or conditions that tend to interfere with the right performance of the job. Of all the interferences possible, the concept of autocracy is sure to be one.

3. *Sciences That May Throw Light upon These Problems*

Our starting point. If we accept the idea that the subject matter of public school administration is to be used to prepare young people for administrative work in our schools and, so, that all items of the subject-matter must be selected on the basis of their value in such training; if we accept the idea that the function of subject matter is to reveal the essential nature of whatever it is we desire to learn (of facts, skills, attitudes, tastes) and that the essential nature of administration is to be found in the nature of the job to which administrative activity is applied; if we accept the idea that administrative authority is for specific purposes, that it is granted to officers but not to persons, and that, by the nature of its origin it is intended to instrument, but never to defy, either science or social standards; if we accept the idea that our public schools are a part of the state and not a mere servant to do the bidding of the state, that, being state schools, their policies must function harmoniously with those of the state, and, since the state is the people, that the schools must express the intellectual and cultural needs and purposes of the people; and finally, if we accept the dictates of scientific knowledge about the processes of learning, care, and teaching, as well as about administration, we may now proceed to inquire as to the sources from which we may expect to obtain the proper subject matter for this field.

Public education and the state. With these premises, it is clear that the schools are in no sense an independent concern, apart from the world; instead, they derive their meaning from the part they play in the total scheme of life. They could hardly be more intimately interlocked in their

nature with anything than they are with the state, since to administer a public school enterprise is to execute a function of the state. The public school is the state at work; to know the school one must know the state. In reality, then, school administration is a branch of public administration;[19] further, the school is preparing young people for citizenship in the state.

Public schools and our law. The field of law is so related to political science and to the effective existence of the state and of state schools that school administration could hardly neglect the field of law as a source from which to draw a part of its subject matter.[20] During the past half century —mostly, in the past quarter century—developments in the field of administrative law have gone on apace. This development, better than almost anything else, reflects the essential changes that have been made and that are now going on in the real nature of our government. School administrators who are not aware of this development and who have not considered both the advantages and the dangers of these trends are most likely unconsciously to accept the ideas of the movement and to introduce practices that, while they are well enough suited to the management of men in matters affecting property rights, are not suited to the management of men who are teaching school.

Public schools and economics. Our schools are similarly interlocked with our economy. The schools must own and operate properties; they must employ many people. In the activities essential to this, the schools have to assume economic as well as legal rights and responsibilities. They must know the processes, the techniques, the forms of language, the customs, and the proprieties of the realm of industry, commerce, trade, and labor. This is a wide realm, and equipment for handling it must vary somewhat from

[19] See Gordon D. Clapp, "Toward a Science of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 1:82–84, Autumn, 1940.

[20] See Cassius J. Keyser, "On the Study of Legal Science." *Yale Law Journal,* 38:413–422, February, 1929.

that best suited to private business; for, whereas the objective of private business is profit, that of the schools is service. The results of effort at one of these are readily recognized and measured; as to the results of the other, it is often difficult to detect and next to impossible to measure them. In this realm, as in the realms of politics and of law, there has been great change—change to which there can be no end that we can forsee.

Public schools and religion. The contact of our schools with the religious life and enterprises of the people is equally intimate; and, in time, we shall likely come to see that these relationships are more important than our prejudices, so far, have permitted us to recognize. Separation of church and state seems as wise now as ever it did, but separation of religion from activities devoted to intellectual and cultural development need not inevitably be the result. Historically, religion has been as much the source of drive in human action as has business or politics. This may be expected to remain a fact about the nature of man. If of religion we say that it doesn't keep pace, then, perhaps education may have failed to do its proper part in this department of life. But in religion there has been change. Some of it, we hope, is due more to enlightment than to prejudices or treasured fears or superstitions. What the schools may be able to do to promote the gain, through enlightment, is yet a question, perhaps; but that school administration should observe and understand and work at this problem is clear, if we accept the idea that education is concerned with the whole child and the whole of society. Society will not discard religion; perhaps it may even demand a larger place for religious development.

Public schools and our culture pattern. Besides government, law, business, and religion, there are other interests and institutions and devices, each in its place an essential part of our total scheme of life. Our language, our traditions, customs, conventions, proprieties, manners, and dress; our common beliefs, our standards of good taste, our principles and standards and forms of conduct—all these and

the thousand lesser things that combine to form the network of the social fabric, the cultural pattern, the institutional mechanism and life of our time, are a part of the world in which and for which the school exists.

These elements of the mechanism and processes of our society are equally a part of the mechanisms and processes of the state, the law, the economic and the religious enterprises, and no less so, of the schools.[21] They function, not only by setting limitations and standards that all men, including administrators, must respect; but also, by providing common viewpoints and channels or media for self-expression and for communication, without which there could be no society. Since administration cannot fail to recognize these social forces, it must know how to live with them and how to use them; also, how to keep them alive and healthy and prevent their becoming a dead-hand control in schools that are training our young people for a culture that is alive and responsive to conditions and forces, new and old, alike.

Public schools and the learning process. One should not have to present reasons for including knowledge of education as a part of the subject matter of school administration, except for the facts, above presented, regarding the basic nature of administration. One may accept the principle that the nature of the administrative process derives from the nature of the job; but when contending forces in his district become strong and active, he may find it necessary at times to choose between yielding at one point or losing on all for the schools. For several reasons, such yielding grows on what it feeds upon; so its beginning should be a warning to strengthen the claims of science or of law, sometimes of ethics, against it. For this a knowledge of education—its nature, its purpose, and its anticipated products, as well as the processes, techniques, and materials essential to its success—is all that will suffice.

[21] This represents a point of view by which one considers the values or the ends toward which, as well as the methods by which, administration works.

Understanding the nature of public education in the sense here indicated—as one of the many aspects of a complex culture or as an enterprise closely interlocked with all the other major enterprises, public and private, of society—reveals that it is impossible to understand education by studying it out of this setting. To be sure, many things about education can be studied in isolation, or near isolation; but these separate items are but parts, which have to be fitted into the whole, and the whole is seen only in the cultural complex here depicted. To try to establish the purpose of public education, or to organize or direct our schools, or to evaluate their output, without reference to this broader base, would be futile.

In passing, one important characteristic of our culture that is profoundly important here is its tendency to change. The significance of this element of change, whether we think of it as social evolution or as mere instability, cannot be overlooked if we are in search of knowledge that will reveal either the nature of the goals toward which the schools are working or the principles that guide the processes by which they do their work. If change is persistent everywhere, it cannot be denied a place among the elements that represent the realities of the culture of which the schools are a part and which it is their purpose to express and to impart, to help to improve. This fact of change has an important implication here. It compels our acceptance of the idea that much of our subject matter for administration must be accepted as tentative—that, somehow, we must accept the function of administration as a changing function, its own nature adjusting continuously to the changing conditions and processes of our society.

Since only to a limited extent at most, can the school administrator go directly to all these sources through actual participation in their activities, he must rely largely upon the sciences that have been constructed as accumulated knowledge about them. So—corresponding to the institutions and interests named—we would have, as sources, politi-

cal science (with special emphasis upon public administration), administrative law, business management, economics, sociology, cultural anthropology, religion, history, and education.

School administration and the arts and sciences. Certainly, one could not understand modern life without some knowledge, also, of chemistry, physics, biology, geology, hygiene, physiology, and many other physical sciences. Certainly, he could not administer schools to fit our life without some understanding and appreciation of its literature, art, music, and architecture. Here, however, we are assuming that students of school administration are college graduates—or near that—and that hitherto they have had general education as their main objective. It is presumed, too, that courses in the social sciences mentioned here as sources of subject matter for school administration, as well as courses in the arts and in other sciences, have been taken as a part of that general-education program. It is in part from what a student has already learned in these fields, and in part from selected advanced courses and by specially directed reading, that administration will draw its needed materials.

As soon as one mentions the science of education as a source for subject matter, he opens the door to many things. The administrator must know education in a broad sense—as a purpose of the state, as an aspiration of the people, as a process (both social and psychological), as an organized and going enterprise, and as a product. It requires many sciences to explain education. Included especially are psychology and many divisions of biology, of anthropology, and of sociology, that together reveal how the facts of these sciences explain learning, study, play, group life, personality development, teaching, health care, discipline, morale, and all the processes that appear in direct school activities. And to explain the material and managerial aspects, some knowledge is required of business, accounting, finance, architecture, plant development, organization, personnel, and public relations, to mention the most obvious.

To the question of how one may hope to learn all that is suggested by these many realms of knowledge, when there are so few who can master even one science in a lifetime, the answers here, are (1) Complete mastery is not required; (2) For the general knowledge required, that is for the program of general education to answer; (3) Here, we are speaking of these fields as sources from which school administration must get a part of its subject matter. One can learn something about almost everything if he cares to do so. Also—and this is the case, here—one can learn something new about what he already knows. If in political science one has learned the main idea of the theory upon which our state is designed, he already has a basis for examining the implications of that theory for the meaning of the word public, in the expression public schools. If, in a course in public administration, one has learned the nature of organization or of budget control, he can quickly turn those principles and many of the techniques to account in the control of school personnel, properties, and moneys. Graduate study must inevitably reach further into these various sciences than the student will have done in his general introduction; but his excursions will be highly specialized and directed and will be almost as much a reorganization as an extension of what he has previously learned.

If acceptance of the idea that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the work it has to perform; if that work is dictated in part by the nature of education (the service to be administered) and in part by the nature of the function of management, a function that we shall examine later; if a study of these lead us to a study of the basic sciences of government, law, economics and business, sociology, cultural anthropology, psychology, and biology; if we assume that in his program of general education the student of administration has gained a sound introduction to each of these great departments of knowledge, then we must consider how to tap each of these sources for its contribution to the subject matter of this new field.

To accomplish this, we must know what it is that we want before we begin to look for it. To know what we want requires that we have a clear notion of the major concepts upon which we propose to establish schools and, likewise, of those concepts upon which we propose to develop the purposes, the structure, and the processes of administration. A consideration of these foundation principles should provide some basis for establishing criteria by which to select our materials.

4. The Order of Approach and the Method of Choosing Materials from These Sources

Subject matter defined. Subject matter is something used to evoke activity through which we learn. To be subject matter, a thing must be able to evoke a response from us, and its nature as a stimulator will have much to do with the kind of response and, so, with the kind of learning that results. We may learn by mental or physical or emotional activity. We may react to what we read, what we examine through any of our senses, or what we imagine or think about or feel emotionally. Facts or principles are not necessarily subject matter at a given moment, merely because they are parts of a science. They also must function in learning. Facts become parts of a science because they fit into a logical arrangement of all the facts that together explain some part of our world; but they become subject matter only when someone uses them to satisfy his wish to understand something or to appreciate something or to be able to do something.

In the present case, the thing we desire to understand, to appreciate, and to do is called public school administration. To be of value as subject matter, what we use must not only contain some truth or information about the nature of the thing we are trying to learn, but it must be in a form suited to evoke not only learning reactions but the special kinds of reactions required by administration.

To provide for learning, we have to take thought of the

learner, of what is to be learned, and of how the two are brought together—in this case, through teaching. We cannot pause here to consider all there is to the process of learning or how the process varies among different individuals or for any one individual at different times. Many of the details are more matters of teaching and study methods than they are of the subject matter that we desire to have learned.[22] For purposes here, we may safely assume that the learner is already broadly educated and that he is capable and desirous of moving independently in his study of this subject, if only he can be shown what to study. The function of teaching on this plane is largely to facilitate the process of learning by helping the student to find and recognize the appropriate subject matter and to approach it in an orderly manner.

What comes first. Here we may properly raise the question as to where the study of administration begins. Shall it begin with the nature of the state, with the laws by which the state provides for schools, with the mechanism or structure of the schools, with the sources of support and plan of their housing and equipment, with the program of instruction, with the process of management, with the personnel of instruction, with the children? All of these suggest vital parts of or approaches to the administrative function. Where does the story begin? The order in which they are here presented may seem logical and not too far from the order of treatment often used in textbooks. For graduate students, something might be said in its favor. In reality, however, the administrator faces children, books, teachers, buildings, equipment, sources of funds available, school boards—none of them in isolation, but all together as a going concern or as a concern to be set up and set going. What is back of this task, in a direct and immediate way,

[22] The danger of separating what we call subject matter from the reaction of the learner to it is obvious; but it is legitimate enough in analysis if we recognize, also, that what makes a thing subject matter is its capacity to evoke appropriate reactions from the learner.

however, is not the theory of the state, or of free schools or of the gross structure of the system, but the problem of what to do now with the children. Further, if budget or housing or equipment or organization questions appear, they are at once practical questions of providing for the needs of the children and the teachers, here and now.

It is not less logical, therefore, to reverse the above order and to begin with the existing educational problem for the children in question, and certainly it is far more psychological. One sees this by asking a question or two. A superintendent faced at the start of his assignment with the question of developing a budget does not ask what the nature of our state requires, but what the needs of the schools call for. He must consider what the state laws and his board rules permit him to do, but this need not concern him until he has found out what he would like to do, *i.e.*, what the schools need. Thus, his first move is a search for the needs of the schools. For this he must go to the schools themselves, to education; and his first act is that of a learner, an investigator, a planner, with good instruction of children as his goal.

As has already been explained, public school administration is a highly complex activity, both in its origin and external responsibilities and in its immediate objectives and processes. As an activity, it must be fitted to its obligations to society—the state, the church, the family, the community life—as well as to the child. All this must be done in terms of the philosophy by which these enterprises exist and in terms of the dictates of science, as its facts and laws apply directly and indirectly throughout the entire enterprise. The people, through their state, created the schools for the purpose of education. Education for children now before us, therefore, is the very first concern—it is education that is to be administered. To clinch this statement that administration begins with a knowledge of education, we have only to add that our state is a democracy, which, with us, is a philosophy and a form of government wherein the good

of the state is made to be consistent with the good of its citizens and where, in practice, both goods are shaped within the limits of truth and fact, of justice, equality, freedom, and liberty. Accordingly, in administering our schools, we do not have to ask what the will of the state is before we ask what science tells us to do educationally.[23] We shall have to know the will of the state, but not in order to decide questions that can be answered by science, for our state assumes that we will accept what science says. After science has spoken, then we turn to government to find out how far we may be able to go.

Thus, we may set it down that a study of school administration can proceed properly only if its students know those parts of the science and philosophy of education which have to do with the learning process in all its bearings. How do children, youth, and adults learn mathematics, art, music, dancing, writing, civics, history, hygiene? How do they learn to be leaders, followers, or independent workers? How do they develop virtue, poise, integrity, industry, persistance under difficulties—all these and the thousand attitudes, skills, and traits of personality and character that these suggest? It is the function of administration to facilitate the processes essential for the achievement of these ends of study and play and life in school; nor do these processes end at school, for, to be true to the purposes of education, they must reach out and interlock with the world outside—

[23] Logically, this statement is too strong, perhaps; for an approach from the reverse standpoint, *viz.*, the nature of the state and of a public school system as an expression of the state, would, if we stick to our concept of the state as a democracy, lead us to consider the administrative problem in the light of the needs of the children in school. Both as a task of teaching and learning and as a task of settling administrative problems, however, it seems more direct, concrete, and realistic to face the children and teachers and school needs as elements to work with, and our theories of state and public education and finance and organization as background and foundation concepts to guide our thinking. We assume that our state derives its nature from the natures of the individuals composing it.

the home, the community, all our institutions and processes of government, business, religion, and social and intellectual life.

Administration not separate from other parts of the science of education. The study of administration does not begin where this study of education ends. That is what, too often, it has tried to do—to assume that administration is a thing in itself, apart from what it administers. Rather, it begins with a restudy of education, asking, How can we arrange facilities, housing, children, and teachers so that this process of learning may go on effectively? This approach is important, in that it reveals an assumption about the nature of administration; *viz.*, that, where possible, it is to make a positive contribution to the activity of learning and teaching and living together, and in no case where the difficulties can be avoided must it in any way introduce difficulties. Here is one of the most important things that the administrator has to learn. What is the subject matter for this lesson?

Possibly there may be a wide variety of subject matter for teaching this lesson. In a way, it is a principle by which we approach any and all administrative tasks, by which we distinguish good from poor administration, by which the administrator thinks about his work. Learning this principle as one learns a poem or a number combination is simple enough, but developing the attitude toward problems, the habit of thought, and the skill in applying the principle, as an investigator of tasks and as a judge of values to work toward, is something more than memorizing. To a mere statement of the principle, therefore, we should have to add provision for wide and continuous activity in applying the principle—not only as an intellectual activity, but, as far as possible, an activity that must be responsible. There is nothing so effective in learning (says education science) as a sense of actual purpose to achieve and of responsibility for results. It is by taking thought of this element of being responsible that one may turn the experience

of using this principle into a powerful motive to learning. And if the end sought is not knowledge alone, but also attitudes and habits of work, then, clearly, drill—or repetition of experience—can help to fix it, as such, and as inseparable from the personality and character of the budding administrator.

If this brief analysis has shown why the student of administration will have to think from a new angle of his knowledge of education, why reasoning from the laws of learning to the solution of problems of school organization or budget making is different from, but not inconsistent with, reasoning from those laws to the problems of teaching and care of health, it may serve to guide our inquiry into the several realms from which it appears we may expect to find the subject matter of this field. It is not meant to imply that our student has learned the science of education as a totally abstract thing. Certainly, his study of educational psychology dealt with real people and with people in groups, and his beginning courses in education could not have taught him of education without some reference to the organization and management of schools. We shall have to admit, however, that there are many teachers who seem to assume that administration is something extraneous, if not somewhat antagonistic, to their work, and some administrators who have not yet learned how to apply education science in their sphere of management.

If these brief sketches may have served to show how the problem of choosing subject matter for this field has arisen, and how important and complicated the problem has become; if in some measure, they have indicated the nature of the problem by revealing the nature of subject matter, together with the principles or criteria by which items may be judged to possess value as subject matter; if they have revealed how the roots of a science of school administration derive much of their sustenance from the broader field of the social sciences, how the immediate substance and structure of the science are inseparable from the sciences of

learning and of the teaching and care of children, and how difficult it is to deal with the nature of the administrative process, apart from the personality of the administrator; and if some light has been thrown upon the problem of where to start and how to arrange materials for study, then we may undertake a closer examination of the several realms within which there is reason to believe our subject matter is to be found. A closer look at administration, as such; at education, public administration, administrative law, economics and business, and cultural anthropology, for what these may have to contribute, will be in place.

Chapter 13. SOURCES FROM WHICH ADMINISTRATION'S SUBJECT MATTER MUST BE DRAWN

In this chapter the various sources of administrative subject matter are examined for why, how, and what they can contribute to the subject matter of this field. The most obvious source is the going school system itself, where one may look directly at administration as a going concern. Following this, the fields of political science, of law, of engineering and business, of sociology and anthropology, and of psychology and biology are examined for what they hold that is basic in any sound undertaking of public school administration.

In the historical approach to a review of what we now have as the subject matter of this field, various approaches to a study of administration are examined; the existing body of literature is analyzed and described as to its arrangement, point of view, and emphasis; and the need of knowledge of the entire mechanism and process of education is further illuminated.

In each of the other fields, attempt is made to show in specific ways how a knowledge of administration must include knowledge of certain basic concepts and principles and many of the important facts that form parts of the subject matter of other sciences and that have been developed by philosophers, scientists, statesmen, economists, and business experts, who had little knowledge of public education but wide knowledge of government, of business, and of the nature of societies and cultures, and who had extended knowledge of psychology and biology.

Some thought is given also to how a student of school administration may best gain access to such a wide range of materials. In this connection, the task of learning so much is not assumed to be a problem for the teacher and textbook writer in this one field alone. General education must lay all these foundations that are really necessary to provide all our youth with basic knowledge about government, law, economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and biology, as these sciences contribute to a general education. To such general education the subject matter of this field must extend and attach itself. The problem of how this may be accomplished is at least partly examined.

1. The Subject Matter of Administration, as Such

Subject matter must center about education. If in the field of administration our order of approach as students for learning, as instructors for teaching, and as responsible executives for performing it, alike, is to be directly, concretely, and soundly educational, with our social, political, and educational philosophies, and our sciences of politics, administrative law, sociology, business, ethics, cultural anthropology, and education, as controlling backgrounds and foundations, then the thread upon which our items of subject matter would be strung would be educational. Thus the job of management—the practical task of organizing and directing the schools as parts of the science of education—must be analyzed with a view to finding the truth about its nature and clews to guide us in presenting the essence of these truths to those who desire to learn, to understand, and to practice administration.

One may think of administration in several quite different ways and, from these, choose one way as the basis in terms of which subject matter would be built up. One may think of administration as a structure or a mechanism, in which case, for his subject matter he would choose facts that would at once describe and reveal the nature of the mechanism. One could view administration as a process. Subject mat-

ter then would describe the process and explain any principles found to be essential to its nature. One could view administration as authority or power to put policies into effect. Here one would be thinking of the job to be done and of the processes by which the schools are instituted and kept going, but he would be thinking of them in terms of the nature and possible behavior of authority or power. A fourth view might see the tasks of management, as such—the building of a budget, contracting for a building, organizing a school or a school service, formulating a curriculum, conducting an investigation, holding a conference, formulating a policy. In that case, subject matter would be developed about a carefully classified list of typical problems, and the items would be chosen for the contribution they could make to the explanation and solution of the problems.

Administrative mechanism as a center of interest. It would seem practically possible to build up a satisfactory course or a textbook on school administration from any one of these four views or ways of seeing the field. The first would seem to stress organization—the mechanism, the form of government—and would be likely to draw heavily upon the fields of political science, industry, and business for illustrations of types of organization and for the principles they represent. But all these would be applied to the problems of school administration. Principles and typical forms of centralized vs. decentralized structures and of functional vs. geographical organizations would be examined. Concepts of the hierarchial relationship, of line and staff organization, of the contacts between line and staff or cleavages that keep these two functions apart, would be major considerations. Always the problem and the solution of the problem would be approached from the standpoint of a machinery for handling it.

Administrative process as a center of interest. The second approach would be thinking in terms of motion rather than of form, of the moving current rather than of the

system of channels holding the current to its course. The activity of organizing, not the resultant mechanism, suggests the approach. As an activity, a process, administration *plans* continuously its every move; it *organizes* children, courses, playgrounds, office procedures, work programs, card catalogues, budgets, building programs; it *directs* the actions of subordinates, the use and disposition of materials, all in terms of purposes and plans; it *coordinates* activities in terms of objectives, of programs or time schedules or progress charts or scientific principles; and it *controls* purposes, activities, costs, personnel, materials, properties, and results, both by direct command and through definite decisions, rules, records, plans, policies, programs, or schedules. Here the stress is upon action—what goes on—not upon the mechanism; yet, the mechanism is only a little in the background, since it is essential as a part of the terminology by which one explains the nature of the process.

Administrative authority as a center of interest. The third approach would be thinking in terms of the authority inherent in administration and would attempt to reveal the nature of administration by explaining the nature and behavior of the power that energizes the administrative mechanism and causes the process to go on. The sources and the nature of authority as it is created in the law, as it is set going through the powers of science or through the force of tradition, custom, or public opinion, would be kept in the foreground. Public administration, administrative law, the science of education, and the science of cultural anthropology would give a strong support to this approach. What does the law or what do the board's rules require or permit? Where does the authority in a given case reside? How is authority distributed? How can legal and scientific and social powers be kept in their proper places and in harmony? These are foreground considerations in this approach, regardless of any particular school problem to which they are to be applied.

The administrative job as a center of interest. In our

fourth approach, mechanism, process, and power are viewed differently. The administrative problem itself is our concern. What is it? Why does it arise? To what other matters is it related? How can it be met? Here the subject matter is selected from such facts about school management as are necessary to reveal the full range of the administrative decisions and actions that are required to keep the school project going in terms of the laws that govern it, in terms of the educational needs of the people it serves (as these needs may be revealed by science and a due respect for and proper application of public opinion, social standards, and the aspirations of the people), and in terms of financial, physical, and other limiting circumstances that, in the case, must be recognized. Here, it is the administrative problem that stands out as our point of departure and as our guide. We see and analyze the problem, then seek a solution. For it we turn to science, to the limits set by rules and laws, and to the public will, to tell us what it is possible and desirable to do; and we turn to our knowledge of mechanism, of process, and of energizing powers, as sources from which we choose principles to guide our action and decide our choice of methods, tools, and devices with which to work. It is to be remembered, of course, that an administrative problem involves an administrative objective, as well as people, materials, time, authority, and the limiting circumstances of the occasion.

The fourth approach seems the one best suited, if only by the fact that it focuses attention upon the service to be rendered by administration, rather than upon administration or upon one or another of the phases of administration, itself.

It seems evident that the problem of what to do must precede the problem of how to do it. In the writer's estimation, it is not that we have neglected to think of the subject matter of school administration from these several approaches and in all the terms here suggested, but that we have not thought clearly enough or fully enough about how to give to these several ways of viewing administration—

each of them quite indispensable—the place it deserves in choosing the subject matter of the field. That each of them suggests a part of the knowledge of administration is obvious; that no one of them can be neglected if one is trying to learn administration is equally obvious. Each of them is a phase, an aspect of the total; or it may serve as a viewpoint from which to examine either the job to be done or the ways and means of doing it.

Whatever laws or principles or patterns we have been able to get from a study of administration, they are what they are only because they have proved their worth in doing managerial work. To know administration, one must know how such principles or patterns have been developed. To know them only as recipes is not to know them well enough to use them, except in a routine fashion, as clerks and administrative mechanics may do, perhaps. Therefore, subject matter must be more than a mere list of rules, routines, techniques, devices, patterns, nomenclatures, or principles. Only if one looks into the derivation of these, into the stuff from which and the conditions under which they were formed, can he understand the real nature of administration. To teach these things apart from the work and the purpose —the administrative objective—that gave rise to them is to give the impression that they are independent of the work. To teach them as features of the work itself is to put them into a genuine pedagogical order.

It seems clear that organization, process, job, and authority are parts or aspects of a total, that all are essential aspects of the task of getting educational work done. How to present this educational work in a manner so that origins, means, and ends, alike, can be learned as they actually are—together—is the question. How can one assemble the essential facts and explain the essential framework, procedures, and skills that combine to form the essence of administration for education?

Administration interlocks with other fields. All our school administrative problems center about two major func-

tions—the creation or founding of schools and allied educational enterprises, and the operation of them, once they have been established. The former is as much background as it is a direct part of administration. Its subject matter is presented through courses in several of the social sciences, but especially, courses in the history of education, in educational philosophy, in educational sociology, in educational psychology, and in general orientation or introductory courses. All these courses are required to provide the starting point for administration proper.

Technically, schools are created through legislation, not through administration; but since it is necessary for the legislator to think of the way schools are to be run, as well as of what they are to be; and since it is equally necessary for the administrator to consider what the schools are and ought to be, as well as of how to run them, it is apparent that the subject matter of administration cannot be limited solely by the technical meaning of the term administration. Further, this legislative function does not end with giving birth to educational institutions. It is made continuous by the fact that changing circumstances change the need for and, so, the nature of the school enterprise, necessitating a continuous reshaping of the creating laws or charters and of the structures, purposes, and programs.

This close and continuous contact of legislation with administration is further apparent in the work of trustees of colleges, boards of education, and directors of libraries or museums or associations devoted to education. These officials are minor legislative functionaries, who work largely at problems brought to them by those in administrative charge.

It would be right to say that facts and principles pertaining to the problem of formulating educational objectives (for the nation, the state, the district, the school, the class, the child, or a professional organization) are administrative subject matter. But it is equally clear that political science, history of education, educational philosophy, and several

other fields must have an interest in these same problems, each from its special angle. This but further illustrates what has been noted above and what all curriculum workers are familiar with, that all subjects have their roots in, or other connections with, other subjects and other fields.[1] Deciding what to teach about educational objectives in the course in administration and what, of these, to teach in other courses is a curriculum problem, as well as a course problem, and its disposition may wisely vary from place to place. When we speak of a subject, we are not of necessity speaking of a single course. To ignore the fact that certain matters pertinent in Course A have been taught in Course B or Course C is to be considerably less than clear in our program of instruction.

Saying that educational objectives, as above, and the whole process of creating public education in all its forms is a part of the subject of school administration does not mean that all this is to be taught in one course only, and that whatever is taught of educational objectives in other courses is to be ignored. Here we are in search of the subject matter of administration, not of the separate courses by which administration is to be taught. At this point, note is taken of the relation of administration to the previous governmental function that we call legislation, and to the bearing that this connection has upon the relation of the subject matter of administration to that of a number of other fields. How administration contacts and utilizes these fields will be more closely examined later.

Three realms of knowledge essential. When we turn to the second major division of our field, that of operating the schools, we do not let go our hold upon goverment, society, community, laws, traditions, religions. Instead, we act in terms of the responsibilities and privileges of the membership that the school holds in these over-all enterprises. Our

[1] The problem of the overlapping of courses still haunts most of the social sciences and shows that we have built courses with too little concern for curriculums.

administrative purposes, acts, decisions, and orders become the working extensions of the state, of the legislature, of the customs, and of the social aspirations of the people. But these are not all it takes to run the schools; for regardless of what the state may will to have done, human nature sets limits that cannot be ignored. Here we must move in terms of biological and psychological, as well as of political and cultural law. Or, more concretely, organization and management must not thwart but must facilitate the working of the laws of learning, of health, of child care and development, of personality growth, for which the schools exist. It is not good administration to build a schoolhouse merely as a shelter, merely as a means of keeping track of and controlling the conduct of children. A school building must become, as well, an instrument of instruction and care. Its function is positive, not merely neutral or negative.

This means, then, that administration has another set of contacts to deal with. If we say of administration that its roots are to be found in government, in law, in the mechanism of our culture, then perhaps we may say, also, that its tendrils are entwined about the materials and activities of instruction, reaching into the life, the work, and the play of the children and their teachers. Thus administration lies between two sets of powerful and dominating forces. It must be faithful to both. These are not two millstones that grind the purposes, the powers, or the activities of any administrator who has a proper understanding of these upper and nether realms; instead, they are sources from which administration derives many, if not most, of its purposes and most of its basic concepts and principles—sources that provide the most trustworthy illumination by which it may study and test its own processes and mechanism.

There is yet a third source to which we must turn, however, as we try to take account of the elements involved in the activity of administration. The third source is the administrative activity itself. The nature of our government and our society tells us what kind of education and schools

we need and want; the laws of teaching and learning—the science of education—particularize this and tell us how we must proceed; but, finally, the *capacity of administration* to formulate and to direct has also to be considered. As was noted above, administration is carried on by persons. Men are not and do not act as if they were shadows of some unalterable law; neither have they the capacity of ghosts or fairies to move, at wish and successfully, to any purposes that they choose. Administrators are human, and, as was noted above, those whose affairs are being administered are also human. An order is sound only if it is properly conceived, properly formed, properly given, properly received, and properly responded to. This is a chain that is no stronger than its weakest link.

Since in many cases there are several good ways of doing things; and since one acts in terms of his own knowledge, his own skills, his own judgment, his own taste, his own personal wishes, often his own prejudices, there will be differences of opinion as to the wisdom—sometimes, the fairness—of administration. Thus, it must be that some plans and some procedures will succeed, while others fail. To administer well, therefore, one must know the nature and capacity of administration itself. It was argued above that the principles of administration are not drawn from administration, as such, but from administration at work doing things. It follows that in our search for subject matter we shall need to study these three realms—the social sciences, the science of education, and the science and philosophy of administration—together, always checking the facts and principles from one with those from the other two before reaching a conclusion. That is, having found the problems of administration, we shall need to examine them separately and together, in the light of facts and meanings derived from the study of each of these three realms.

What, then, are the problems? It would be easy to prepare a list of typical problems, but not so easy to prepare a list that would contain all the essential subject matter of the

field. To do the latter, one must think of the arrangement and completeness of the list. No attempt will be made here to present such a comprehensive list. For the results of the best thinking on this matter, to date, the reader is referred to the many current textbooks in the field, each of which represents the ideas of the author on this question. Here the purpose will be to characterize what we have so far done toward formulating the subject matter of the field and to comment upon some aspects of the task yet ahead of us as the writer sees it.

Subject matter now in use. The literature of school administration, already extensive as a division of a university library, is growing rapidly. It is found in cyclopedias and other reference works; in broad, general treatises covering the whole field or a major division of it; in special studies of problems or divisions of the subject; and in brief reports or articles, devoted to some narrower problems. The literature includes fact, opinion, argument, and of recent years, some exhorting, perhaps. It covers what may be called the philosophy and the history, as well as the science and practice, of administration. It is concerned with administration's purposes, its mechanism, its authority, its processes, and its products.

Referring to that part of this literature which has been prepared as subject matter for use in instruction, we have many broad, comprehensive treatises—textbooks—that attempt to present practically the entire field of school administration. These books are by no means identical in content or in arrangement of materials. Some have stressed description and explanation of the machinery, techniques, and methods of administration; others have stressed objectives, theories, principles, with some less attention to patterns, recipes, and methods. In arrangement, some have begun with the local district, leading up to state and national problems; others have reversed this order. Also, some have started from the contact of administration with instruction and have led outward to the perimeter of major functions,

structure, and philosophy of the educational system; while others have worked in a course that is the reverse of this.

Besides these broader treatments, there are treatises devoted to a part of the field only. Of these there are two main types: one is devoted to a single unit of a school system, as, to a state school system or a local school system or, narrower still, to the college or to the high school; and the other is devoted to the administration of some one function, such as business management, finance, personnel, or public relations. These narrower treatises vary in their organization and points of approach and emphasis in much the same way as do the general treatises.

These narrower treatises have been produced because it was long ago found out that choice had to be made between a general book of immense size and separate treatments of special parts of the field. In either case, the number of courses offered had to be greatly extended and the treatment of special areas and functions had to be intensified.

There is a third type of treatise, occasionally used as a text, but designed more especially for use in instruction in a supplementary way, or with advanced students in seminar work. These treatises are related, in part, to the comprehensive and, in part, to the restricted treatise types. Their concern has been, either with a special aspect and phase of the administrative service or with a special, narrow problem. Some have dealt largely with theoretical subjects; others, with very concrete matters. *Educational Administration as Social Policy,*[2] *City School Administrative Controls.*[3] *The Management of the School Money,*[4] *Accounting Procedures for School Systems,*[5] *Budgeting in Public Schools,*[6] *School*

[2] Jesse H. Newlon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

[3] Jesse B. Sears. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

[4] Henry C. Morrison. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 1932.

[5] Fred Engelhardt and Fred Von Bergersrode. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

[6] Chris A. DeYoung. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1936.

Bonds,[7] *The Administration of Pupil Transportation,*[8] and *The School Board Member*[9] are representative of a very long list of titles covering these more specialized and intensified works.

Leaving this group of books, one moves away from directly instructional materials to a wide range of still more specialized books, monographs, and articles, embodying the results of investigation and research, presenting official reports, reporting the educational news, or giving expression to opinion in the field.

Comments on the subject matter now available. As one views any one of the treatises designed as texts, he can easily find good or bad to say of it; more often he can say both. Each of them has been designed for a special kind of teaching situation and cannot fairly be expected to serve all kinds of purposes. Each has brought together what the author regarded as the subject matter best suited to the instructional purposes and organization and methods he had in mind. Considering the short time we have had to produce these books and the rapid expansion of the field covered by them (viewed in respect to objectives, to size of project, and to scientific knowledge available), we must say that the special defects of any one book dwindle in importance as one surveys the whole. That there is now a well-developed body of subject matter no one acquainted with it can be in doubt. Our present need is mainly to become more intelligently critical and discriminating in its interpretation and use.

It is the writer's opinion that, taken as a whole, there is an adequate amount of fact about most of our present and immediately forseeable problems of administration, large and small; a good start has been made toward an underlying philosophy for the field; some headway has been gained in

[7] John Guy Fowlkes. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1924.

[8] Ward G. Reeder. Columbus, Ohio: The Educators Press, 1939.

[9] John C. Almack. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

our study of the nature of administration, and from this some foundation in administrative principles has been secured.[10] We have gone far to get an explanation of the necessary mechanism and the techniques and procedures of administration; and we have a body of school law the nature and scope of which our textbooks have very well explained. Further, this literature is not dead or decadent. It is very much alive and is showing a healthy growth.

If one asks for negative criticism of this collection of materials, writers will differ. Some will urge that, by its arrangement in books and by its viewpoint and interpretation, it emphasizes the concept of autocracy while pretending to be democratic; that it points too often to easy procedures, when it should be pointing to right ones, that is, that our subject matter leans toward making administration an end rather than a means; that we stress the mechanism, to the detriment of the purpose and the nature of the function; that we think in terms of authority, when we should be thinking in terms of knowledge of the case in question. Textbook writers have not been blind to these criticisms. But neither have they been blind to the fallacies of many of them or to the practical capacities and limitations of administrators. The oldest and most orthodox text that we have need not stand in the way of the instructor's purpose to stress democratic management. Many will prefer the kind of democracy that can be sensed between the lines of some of the more orthodox treatises to that which appears within and between the lines of a few others, whose authors

[10] In this area we have still far to go in sorting out and defining our principles. Sometimes we have confused principles with what are in reality tricks of the trade; even more, we have not distinguished clearly enough between principle and what is accepted as general belief or what stands as the result of general but untested observations. There is a place for philosophy—we must choose values to work for; but there must be a place within the practice of administration for principles of action, for principles that have been tested and shown to be always valid. In this direction there is much yet to be done.

seem to desire mainly to focus administrative power upon a particular brand of social reconstruction.

These extreme views are few, however, and they are already recognized as shallow, if not stupid. Certainly they are not important. The profession may feel a just pride in its administrative literature, which, in every corner of it, reflects the changes that have developed in education, even if at times these seem belated. Moreover, it has had no small part in conceiving these changes as well as in putting them into practice in our schools. What we need is still more textbooks and still more of the more intensive studies to support the texts. The writer's feeling is that in our instruction we have, for too long and too exclusively, stressed training in *how to administer,* and that now we need not less emphasis there, perhaps, but much more upon *how to find out how to administer.* Besides, we need to make sure that our students shall become acquainted with the wide realm of literature herein made available, and not alone with the content of one textbook. The reason for this is obvious. We want the student to be exposed to the subject (to all the problems), and no single book contains the whole aspect.

There are many ways of viewing facts and there are many meanings of facts and principles. These the student can discover best for himself if he finds them in a wide variety of settings, such as are possible only if he reads many books. Further, one knows any subject only by thinking much about its facts and principles. One's thought about a fact is likely to be nearly in proportion to the number and variety of settings (number of meanings) in which he finds the fact or in which he tries to use it or to test its use. So, wide exposure to the literature is the only hope we have that our student will know the subject and that he will not get wrong or incomplete ideas because of the particular presentation of his "one and only" book. One knows administration better when, beyond realizing its reaches and its problems, he knows the people and the institutions that are building

the science and the subject; when he knows that the literature is growing and that the subject is in process of being expanded and remade, so that what he learns today may not be true a year hence, after new situations have developed or new facts have been discovered.

The point here is that the subject matter of school administration consists of much more than bare facts and principles. It includes all of these, to be sure; but facts and principles are not subject matter in this case until they are functioning in practice. Take the facts of finance. For finance to function, there must first be a purpose to serve (public instruction); then, there must be funds. Here we have all the facts and theories of school support to deal with. We have the practice of budgeting, that is, of expressing specific instructional purposes and plans in financial terms; we have the facts of spending the funds, involving purchasing and inventory controls; we have accounting; and we have evaluation of what our financial policies have produced. All the way, the facts of law making, of taxation, of budgeting—down to the final use of the goods bought—are facts at work in education. Each fact and each principle is concrete, as well as abstract; and to know it fully as part of administration is to know it in this double setting. School money is an expression of a state's and of a community's public policy. It moves by laws and is set going by officers who follow those laws; it buys materials and services and, in this, uses the processes, techniques, and standards of private business. But in doing these things, school money also reflects the purposes and the processes of classroom instruction. What do the teachers and children need? When do they need it? How much do they need? To answer, one must know how children learn and how teachers teach.

Our textbooks in school administration vary less in the facts and theories they offer than in the presentation of those facts and theories in their proper educational setting. That there should be a lag in this phase of our subject-matter

development is very easy to understand. In most classrooms, one can detect a corresponding lag in methodology. And note how long it took guidance to learn to think in terms of the learning and teaching processes, instead of in terms of organizing and directing children. If this is still a major weakness of our subject matter in administration, at least we have made substantial headway in our efforts to overcome it.

If one were to try to characterize the subject matter of school administration proper in the light of the materials we have assembled in our textbooks, to date, and in the light of the best our wider literature offers, as a conception of what that subject matter should include, he would find that it includes facts and principles, with descriptions, analyses, explanations, and interpretations, bearing upon problems centering about the following:

1. The purposes of education—conceived in the light of our social and political philosophy, of the specific needs and capacities of students and communities, and of the practical circumstances and possibilities.

2. The program and activities of education—explained in terms of its purposes, as above; in terms of the process of formulating it in any given case; in terms of its organized subject matter, as curriculums, courses, special services, and activities.

3. The administrative organization of the personnel and materials of education—for the care and counseling of children; for instruction and allied services; for direction, coordination, and control—all with a view to establishing purposes, defining responsibilities, and locating and channeling authority.

4. The nature and activities, the possibilities and limitations of the administrative process—as it operates in terms of law, or as it operates through the discretion of officers; and as it carries out its essential functions of planning, or-

ganizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling, in the definition and solution of representative problems from all parts of the field.

This subject matter would deal with purpose, program, structure, process, and authority, because each of these is an indispensable part. It would deal with instruction as it would with properties and business, not as an independent element, but as a part of a unified enterprise. It would deal with school and with the state, but it would think of the school as a part, not as a tool or as a subject, of the state. It would deal with teaching and with management, but they would be treated as colleagues, not as antagonists. Mechanism would be thought of as alive, as functioning, and also as changing or growing. Authority would be something objective and impersonal, to be respected and used, not a private possession to be feared or sought after for selfish gain.

With this brief characterization of administrative subject matter before us, in lieu of a more complete topical outline of it, we may now turn to its contacts with other fields. Only hints have been given as to how administration draws sustenance from other fields. The nature of these contacts are believed to be very important in giving meaning to the school and to its administration. An attempt may be made to indicate a little more fully what these contributions are. What of government, of law, of the nature of society, of our culture, of business, of psychology must the administrator know in order to understand school administration?

2. *Subject Matter from Political Science*

The word "public" in public education. Our concern here is with public education; accordingly, account must be taken of the public. This we can do only by study of the government that creates and, so, gives purpose and form and provides ways and means for the schools—the enterprises that are to be administered.

It is obvious that states must create courts, police, armies, schools, all as means of attaining their own, the states', purposes. It is obvious, too, that they must provide each of these services with administrative authority, accordingly. The purposes of education here being to contribute to the well-being of the state, one can understand the schools only if he understands the state itself. A state is the sum of the efforts made toward the attainment of the various purposes it sets up for itself, the functions it performs, the powers it assumes and exercises. Each function—in this case, public education—thus becomes, in fact, a part of the state. Thus, by its origin and nature, the public school is the state at work. Whoever takes charge of the school becomes an officer of the state, responsible for keeping that enterprise faithful to the over-all purposes of the state as a whole.

Our schools and the nature of our state. Since to understand a part of any unit, one must understand the whole, it is apparent that the nature and purposes of our schools can be understood only if we comprehend the nature and purposes of our government itself. This calls for a knowledge of the foundations of the state—our political philosophy, together with the social philosophy that it expresses. These are to become the foundation of our philosophy of education and, so, of school administration. What is this self-government idea? What is democracy—its purposes, its processes, its possible forms, its capacity to do work, its strengths, its weaknesses? To be intelligent in this realm, one must know these matters as they were born and as they have existed in history; he must know them by comparative study of other concepts of government, and he must know them as they are behaving in our country today in the various divisions—Federal, state, and local—of our government.

School administration as government. In the second place, one must know the program or programs of our government, of which education is but one of many units. There is a program of protection against outside enemies,

through military and diplomatic agencies, and against dangers from within, through police, courts, health, and public-safety agencies. There is a vast and growing program of social developmental service, carried on through many separate agencies devoted to recreation, entertainment, education, promotion of the arts, experimental and other forms of research, exploration service, and dissemination of knowledge. There is a third program, in which the government assumes ownership and control of properties and business and conducts economic enterprises believed to be useful to the economy and the general welfare of the country. The public schools, which are a feature of the second of these three groups of complex and far-reaching activities, can be understood only if we see them fulfilling a proper part in the total structure. One understands all this government activity only if he has studied many of the chapters of our broader treatises on political science. Further, a study of the public school program without some knowledge of this political setting of public education in our country is almost certain to result in a distorted and incomplete understanding of it.

In the third place, one must know the structure of our government and the theory upon which powers and responsibilities are distributed to Federal, state, county, township, city or town, and district. The mechanism of our scheme of public education fits into this greater framework, expresses this theory of distributed powers, and should function harmoniously with other parts of this structure.

In the fourth place, along with government purposes, programs, and structure, one must know the processes by which work goes on. How does our country decide what functions it will assume? How does it design a plan, an organization, for doing the work? Finally, how does it proceed in doing this? Here we come face to face with administration as an activity. We must have ways by which the government decides to take on new services or to close out services no longer useful. We must have ways of

planning for what we are to do. We must have ways of creating and assigning authority and responsibility. This is the legislative function. Following this comes administration, or execution of the plans. The extent of the latter feature of our government is very great and is growing faster than any other feature.[11] Administration by individuals and by boards, committees, tribunals, panels, and commissions, in endless variety, represents the cutting edge and, in a sense, the growing edge of our government as it does its work. In scope, these agencies serve the nation as a whole, the state, or a more local unit of government; and they carry on, in almost endless variety, what we call our public services.

There are many aspects of public administration. It operates in terms of laws, to be sure; but beyond the law, in all administrative work, there is wide room for the use of discretion. Certain of our Federal administrative tribunals have exceedingly wide powers of discretion, being governed only by the broadest and most general statutes. The school board also has quite wide discretionary powers. In this freedom to rule at will we are already seeing some dangers to democracy through the development of the evils of bureaucracy.[12]

Human nature (a major consideration where discretion is involved) is much the same in all these services, whether it is working on education, at the control of railroad tariffs, or in operating an electrification project. School administrators need to understand our whole scheme of public-administration activities (1) because education is one of them and (2) because they are alike in principle and, to some extent, in the devices and procedures that they use. They are alike, too, in being the interpreters of public pur-

[11] Woodrow Wilson called attention to this trend in his early writings. See James M. Landis, *The Administrative Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

[12] See Alexander Peikelis, "Administrative Discretion and the Rule of Law." *Social Research,* 10:22–37, February, 1943.

poses and the determiners of what our country is to mean to us in protection and cultural support and uplift. By the nature of our government, there can be no better perspective for school administration than that afforded by an understanding of the administrative activities of its many departments. How do we direct our public health services? How do we handle our system of courts, our police services, or manage the army and navy? How do we control interstate commerce? How have we recently controlled prices and a hundred other services on a national scale? How do we, and how else might we, control education? All of these combine to make our government. All of them are administering laws, or services, as one may view it. They must be kept together, each as a part of the whole.

School administration and public finance. A special part of government and, so, related to its purpose, program, structure, and process alike, is the problem of ways and means. Schools, like other government services, have to be supported. Taxation for schools has a few special matters to consider, but these in no way negate the basic principles of taxation. School finance is but a part of the problem of public finance, whether one is thinking of the theory and practice of taxation, of public economy, or of the practical question of getting income for the schools. We have to budget for the schools and account for school moneys as we do in the case of other services, and the principles and techniques are much like those in use throughout the government. Spending or purchasing for the schools is little different in principle from that essential in all public services. Trying to manage school finance without knowing public finance is to invite disjunction in our public services, to invite narrowness of view and what that brings of misunderstanding and poor management.

School administration builds upon a general education program. If this may serve to indicate points of contact between the subject matter of school administration and that of political science—especially, that part of the latter which

we call public administration and public finance—we may ask, How can all this be drawn into the subject of school administration? As has already been suggested, much of this will normally be learned in high school and college as part of the general education program.[13] The part that school administration offers is that which is necessary to show how education fits into these other services; how it works with them; how it uses the same basic concepts and principles and many of the same forms, processes, techniques, and methods. In this the purpose is to get the student to see public education as a responsible division of our government, as one of many public services, and not as something subordinate to and obeying orders from a superpower. Its obligation is to keep education what our country ought to have as education. This is creative work and it is government in the highest sense only if it is properly conceived and kept attuned to the nature and purposes of our nation.

A course in school administration cannot stop to teach the rudiments; it must assume that these are understood and, in presenting such a problem as school support, it must explain the plans and theories, not in isolation, but as features of a state and local revenue system. In its study of how to introduce and manage research in a school system, the problem can be greatly illuminated by a consideration of the uses and management of research in other branches of government, to say nothing of the way these sources may be drawn upon by school research. A discussion of school public-relations work could be greatly illuminated by knowledge of the way public opinion is drawn into the *processes of legislation and administration* and of the way, in government, sound public relations work through dissemination of information can be confused with dangerous propaganda campaigns.

[13] If it is not, then that deficiency should be overcome by directed reading when no other way is possible. School administration cannot take over the whole of this foundation building work.

Government road-building programs cannot be ignored by those who are reorganizing school districts; city zoning work, park system, and traffic regulations cannot be left out in our study of locations for school buildings; the machinery and processes of public-health services cannot be ignored by school systems. What the nation or state may be doing to foster infant industries, to improve living conditions of people, to expand opportunities for recreation as a means of protecting health and elevating the cultural level, to disseminate information to the people, to improve international relations, to prevent war, and to care for the unfortunate—all this is of concern to the school, for the school is working as an instrument of this effort at social progress, as well as at the task of preserving the best in our culture and maintaining the cultural level against the forces that hamper and pull it down. Our government, in this broad sense, is thus a major part of the basis for understanding public schools and their management.

3. *Subject Matter from the Realm of Law*

Public education and the field of law. School law has come to be an extensive field for study, whether one thinks of the state school statutes or of the court decisions that have resulted from litigation, or of official rulings of attorneys general or other high authorities, or of the rules and regulations—the sublegislation—of school boards and trustees. Much of this law is, in fact, the starting point for the study of school administration and has been so recognized in our textbooks and teaching. To the school law all must turn for definition of purposes, programs, organization, powers, and many of the major procedures that affect the schools.[14] The school district can sue and be sued, it can lay and collect taxes, by right of eminent domain it can purchase and own any property needed in its work, it can contract for

[14] See Newton Edwards, *The Courts and the Public Schools.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

services or materials, it can make rules for the conduct of the schools and state universities. Other separate enterprises are similarly supported by charters or by other founding and controlling instruments of law.

These bodies of law vary from state to state, but in principle they all reflect the same basic idea of the part that education is to play as a function of the government. The schools are free, all children and youth may, and certain of them must, attend. For this reason the state is divided into districts, varying widely in detail of purpose and size and program and management, but small enough so that schools will be local in nature.[15] Through all the school codes of the states one can find these basic principles showing. The laws differ in endless ways, but all reflect the same underlying political purposes and the same social and legal principles.

Whether one refers to the constitutional and statute law, or to the various books or codes of rules and regulations—the administrative law—he can say that law is a very direct part of what we call the facts and principles and, so, of the subject matter of school administration.[16] But there is more to this matter than knowing as routine the laws and rules by which we have to administer the schools. There is the whole concept of the science and philosophy of law itself and, especially, the newer concept of the science and philosophy of administrative law, as it has been developed in our country. School laws and rules are but one expression of

[15] For education it is important that we do not use nation- or state-wide laws to form and direct learning activities that are essentially individual in their natures, or to control for community relationships to the school. For the philosophical background of this, see John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1927.

[16] One interested in the broader aspects of administrative rules and regulations will find an illuminating exposition of the problems in Frederick E. Blachly and Miriam E. Oatman, *Federal Regulatory Action and Control.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1940.

our law, and to know its nature and its possible uses and abuses one should have at least some notion of that larger realm—jurisprudence—which they represent.[17]

The school law proper consists of certain provisions in the state constitution (not all states) and a collection of statutes (sometimes organized as a code). This body of law creates the school system, at least as a plan, ready for action of the people. The people must apply these laws by taking up and assigning the authority provided for. This they can do by following what is prescribed in the law. In the law, besides the creating of the schools, provision is made for their operation. The scheme of operation is effected by two means. The first is by the statutory provisions. These, being alike for all parts of any one state, must be in broad, general terms that require interpretation for application to any specific situations. For this latter purpose, the statutes provide for certain officials—state officials, to see that the statutes are made effective in all districts, and district officials, to attend to actual details of application locally. The second means is that the statutes empower these officials to make and enforce any rules they may require in carrying out their duties.[18] Usually it is provided that interpreting the laws and extending them in the form of special regulations shall be in the hands of a board—a state board of education for the state as a whole, and a county and/or district board of education for local units—and that actual application or execution of the laws in each case shall be in the hands of a single officer—a state superintendent or commissioner, or a district superintendent. In most states,

[17] The background here suggested is indicated in Roscoe Pound, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942; and his earlier *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922. Or see Jerome Frank, *If Men Were Angels—Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

[18] Jesse B. Sears, *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

a middle coordinating link in the managerial mechanism is provided for by a county board and executive.

The administrator's attitude toward the law. It is true that one can learn the routine of this vast network of legal control somewhat incidentally, while studying the schools as they are, and can get on as an administrator; but he will get on better by keeping out of the law's way than by bringing it into positive and constructive action in shaping and directing the school system. One cannot rightly think of these legal frameworks and purposes in his school system as mere restraints, as the boundary lines of his little realm. Properly conceived, they are far more than that. They embody concepts of the basic laws of the nation; as application of that law, they are expressions of a theory of public administration. Only by understanding their legal nature—along with their political, as well as educational, purposes—can one understand their administrative significance, without which one's use of them must remain on the level of the mechanic, instead of on the level of the statesman, as it should be.

The function of administration can be understood as law at work in the accomplishment of the purposes of the nation, the state, the community—school administration, as law accomplishing our educational purposes—only if one has this general picture of the legal nature of administration so clearly in mind that it will affect his thinking and his decisions on administrative problems. To gain such an understanding, one must have thought more than casually about such political principles as that of separation of powers; about the historical facts of the way administration has been expanded as a function of our government in the past few decades;[10] and about the efficiency-engineering movement, with its effects on practices in all business administration.

Law and rule by man. Administration is rule by man.

[10] See The President's Committee on Administrative Management, *Administrative Management in the Government of the United States.* Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1933.

The field of public administration is created and limited by legislation. Where the law leaves off, rule by man begins and from there carries on to the limits of its legal confines. If legislation assigns very wide fields to administration, then many questions of detail will arise.

In administering, it will be necessary to decide what purposes and procedures for which no statutory prescriptions are available are to be followed, and to have machinery that will provide guidance and inspection; often it may be necessary to provide penalties for not following directions. Soon, in such cases, an extensive body of regulations—sublegislation, it has been called—develops. In some cases, also, the major law has empowered the administrator (individual or board) to adjudicate cases and to enforce penalties. Is this a negation of the principle of division of powers, of checks and balances; or is it a new kind of government function? The science and the philosophy of law have tried to determine this.

This development of rules and regulations has gone to great lengths in our Federal government and has grown extensively in our state and local governments. The school board is just such an administrative body, operating for the state; but each board is limited to a small territory. School boards have wide powers and, in practice, have used rules and regulations to guide and control actions affecting the schools. The practice of using rules is growing, partly because they are found practically useful in any school system; but more and more they are becoming a necessity as the growing complexity of school administration makes a more formal control the best insurance against misunderstanding, neglect, and abuse in management.

Upon the question of sublegislation, legal writers have found much to say. Some see in the movement a trend away from rule by law and consider it a grave error.[20] Others regard it as a natural, a logical, and an inevitable

[20] William B. Munro, "Our Vanishing Government of Laws." *California Law Review,* 31:49–58, December, 1942.

growth,[21] fully consistent with our cultural development and altogether desirable. When one considers the nature and the possible uses or equally possible abuses of discretionary power in school administration, it is apparent that this extensive literature on the nature of administrative law must have much in it that could throw light on our task of writing regulations, of developing policies, of delegating authority, of making school assignments, and of evaluating the work of school executives.

A few samples more specific in application may serve to indicate what our subject matter might wish to draw from the field of law. Among the several volumes on school law now available,[22] there is a series of yearbooks of school law (1932–1942). There are, besides, numerous reports of researches in the field and a growing current literature on the subject. In a sense, the literature on school law has grown up on the side, at times aloof from and independent of administration; yet its contact with practical management is apparent, even if much of what it offers has not as yet been woven into the textbooks on school administration.

To begin with, our field of administration is not self-sufficient. It is neither apart from law and government, on one side, nor from the instructional activities in the schools, on the other. Public schools are a legal enterprise because they are state schools. They administer the laws that create and define them as truly as they administer instruction and the services that go with it. If school administration is to be responsible it should use the law in a manner consistent with the nature of law. If law is a growing thing, then administration should not apply it as if it were fixed and unchangeable.[23] Law has grown up from custom in con-

[21] James M. Landis, *The Administrative Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

[22] See Newton Edwards, *The Courts and the Public Schools.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

[23] Read Justice Cardozo's *The Nature of the Judicial Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921; or Jerome Frank's *Law and the Modern Mind.* New York: Brentano's Inc., 1931.

formity with our social and moral standards. It is a feature of our total scheme of life and, by necessity, has been shaped to fit into the total. Law is intended to be stabilizing in its effect, but it should not be deadening. In life there must be a compromise between absolute certainty .and security on one side, provided by a body of unalterable law, and on the other, freedom to change, to live as time and circumstance indicate or compel.

Law and administration must cope with social change. If our theory of education is sure of any one point, it is that education has to meet continuously changing circumstances. Management suited to the curriculum of 1850 would almost certainly destroy the possibilities of the curriculum of 1950. Financial management in use a half century ago would leave many of our schools stranded today. Law must grow, not by addition alone, but also by reinterpretation and adjustment to new meanings. We must get the spirit of growth into our way of thinking of school law and into our ways of working with it.

Law can grow in three ways: by legislation that adds, changes, or repeals; by judicial interpretation that applies old principles to unforseen cases; and by administration that uses discretionary power to meet situations covered only by a broad statute or rule. If one thinks of law as a growing thing, he must regard administration as responsible for a part of that growth. This means that administration must know something about how law grows;[24] it must think of law, not alone as a command to halt here or as an order to do this and then that, but also, as the rule best suited for accomplishing the state's educational purposes as time goes on. This view causes one to look as carefully at the job as he does at the law; not to yield to the law, but to search the law for meanings that can be applied to the case. When a law makes the performance or work difficult or tends to defeat educational ends, it is time for administration to advise

[24] See Frederick R. Coudert, *Certainty and Justice.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1914.

the legislative authority that new legislation is needed. When the law leaves one to use discretion, he should use it, but without defying the law.[25]

Control of discretionary power, a problem. The use of discretionary power is unavoidable in all management, for lawmakers cannot forsee what applications their rules are to have in work like running a school system. A few things that administrators need to know about this kind of power include these: why such power is provided; that it is limited; that it is always assigned to officers, not to persons; that it is to supplement the law, not to thwart it; and that it is easily abused. The reason it is provided is that we believe it is safer to leave some matters to the decision of an officer who is present, who has a chance to understand, and who is responsible for the work. The assumption is that the use of discretion means the use of science to refine and extend the rule of law in our management.

School administration needs this concept of discretionary authority. Yet, how often such power is used for personal rather than official ends. How often it is made a primitive weapon to enforce silence, when discussion might produce the very enlightenment needed.

Discretion lies with the board of education to assign. This the board may do through decisions, case by case as occasion demands, or through a set of regulations. A little study of law can greatly illuminate these two procedures. The one builds up case decisions as a set of precedents; the other anticipates decisions and cases by formulating rules to cover the major purposes, assignments, plans, programs, and procedures as its policies. The latter is more definite and more

[25] Jesse B. Sears, "Administrative Discretion vs. (or with) Rules and Regulations." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 29:257–283, May, 1943. For a legal view, see Charles G. Haines, "The Adaptation of Administrative Law and Procedure to Constitutional Theories and Principles." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1–30, February, 1940; or John Dickinson, "Judicial Control of Official Discretion." *The American Political Science Review,* 22:275–300, May, 1928.

likely to be checked up and made effective by a board; so it is more likely to restrain the administrator who likes to use discretion as a personal power. The small and mean administrator fears the rules because they command him to be consistent in the use of discretion. Administrative law and public administration both have a wide literature on how to formulate such a body of rules, on what they should cover, and on how they should be used in practice.[26] These lessons can be learned and made a part of the explanation of both the theory and the practice of school administration.

Direct control of people lessening. In the early years, the school-district meeting did much legislating for the school, leaving little for the board of education to do. As population centers grew, this practice became impractical. This tended to separate the people from their schools and to exchange direct for representative government. In recent years, there appears a tendency for school boards to conduct more and more public hearings.[27] Many of these are held to discuss proposals affecting school policy, but not a few are used to defend rights, which show that, when the people lose close contact with their schools, either the management tends to be less in line with public wishes or the people are disturbed by lack of understanding of what the schools are doing. The matter of when, why, and how to conduct such a hearing should be approached both as a legal and as an administrative problem. The long controversy between lawyers and judges, on the one side, and public administrators, on the other, concerning powers of boards to make and enforce rules in their special fields, have thrown important light upon all sides of this problem. Together,

[26] See the author's *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938. Also see Ralph S. Fuchs, "Procedure in Administrative Rule Making." *Harvard Law Review,* 52:259–280, December, 1938.

[27] Jesse B. Sears, "The District Meeting in School Government." *The American School Board Journal,* 111:19–21, July; 26–27, August; 27–28, September, 1945.

they offer much that is of value to school administrators.[28]

Thus, whether one considers the statutory laws that govern the schools or the rules and policies by which boards administer the statutes, it is apparent that school administrators must know much statutory law and much of the basic theory and practice of administrative law, in order to direct our schools. Laws governing school-board elections and elections to raise taxes, to issue bonds, to change district lines, and the like; laws and ordinances controlling health, sanitation, protection against fire and accidents; laws limiting school debts, and providing for compulsory attendance, the payment of tuition by nonresidents, the transportation of pupils, various kinds of insurance, and the tenure and retirement of teachers; laws governing the rights and liabilities of members of the board and of the district; laws governing forms of contracts and forms of official records—these suggest what a wide range of direct responsibility the schools have for law observance and law enforcement. Then, when it comes to discretionary powers, other legal angles appear in all these types of cases and hundreds of others, in questions affecting the rights of pupils, of teachers, and of parents, in any of many kinds of situation.

Finally, there is the everyday process of administration in which the law (statutory and discretionary) flows through the channels of the managerial mechanism of the school. How is that law affecting those who set it going, those whose personal efforts carry it into effect and convert its energy into work done? How is it affecting those outside—parents, citizens, and taxpayers—and those who serve the schools—merchants and workmen? How is the law behaving? Does it properly express and support or does it defy the social and ethical rules and standards to which we are accustomed in the profession? Does this law lie like a dead

[28] Charles G. Haines, "Effects of the Growth of Administrative Law upon Traditional Anglo-American Legal Theories and Practices." *The American Political Science Review*, 26:875–894, October, 1932.

hand or like an iron hand upon our schools, or is it being kept awake and sensitive and growing?

4. *Subject Matter from the Fields of Engineering and Business Administration*

Schools a business enterprise. Note has been taken of the extensive contact between schools and business. The schools must raise and expend large funds; they must own and operate extensive properties and be responsible for the sound economic development, maintenance, and operation of them. Incident to this, the schools must employ help, enter into contract, formulate policies, keep records, and make reports, much as does business. It is true that education is a public business, that it is conducted for service and not for profit, but its conduct involves constant use of the instruments, processes, and techniques of private business and must assume most of the obligations that are essential in our private economy. In school administration all this is referred to as school business management.

The difference between school business and private business is important in one respect. When one buys wheat, he can know how much he gets for his money and also, rather exactly, what quality. In education, one may know how many children his money is providing for, but the quality of education is dependent upon the children as well as upon the services and materials and, at best, the return for one's expenditure is rather intangible. The more science finds out about education, however, the more satisfactorily we are able to evaluate the educational product; and further, progress toward still more useful ways of evaluating seems a fair prospect.

Deciding whether to plant wheat or corn in a field, whether to invest in land or bonds, whether to plan to enlarge or to lighten one's stocks of merchandise by a given date, whether to accept a proffered loan, whether to invest in a promising new venture—these are typical problems of the business world and surely the solution of them calls for

careful analysis, for comparison, and for not a little guessing. Parallel in education are decisions on whether to allow classes to increase from thirty-five to forty pupils or to employ more teachers; whether to budget an available sum for developing a new department in the high school or to provide equipment needed in work now going on under handicap; which of three possible school sites to choose, the cost being alike in all; whether to introduce nursery education or to put more money into kindergarten and primary work; whether the state should provide free medical education. The two sets of problems differ in that, in the one, action is taken in terms of economic values; whereas, in the other, the values sought are educational. In both there are unknown elements, so there is guessing and some risk is taken.

It is clear enough that the economic evaluating is not lacking in the educational problems; for one must judge whether so much nursery instruction is worth a defined amount of some other kind, whether shop instruction for 100 boys is worth more or less than supervision of art for, say, 1,000 children. Both types of problems require thinking in terms of dollars; but business asks how many dollars I shall have at the end of the transaction; education asks, how much educational (intellectual, social, moral, aesthetic, physical) development I shall have. Business can count its dollars at the end and be sure to know what gain or loss has resulted. Education can count pupils taught and hours of teaching; and, for practical purposes, it is learning to talk quantitatively about its educational product. Yet, that product is in the form of knowledge, skills, personality, health, taste, the real values of which are not found by offering them at once in the market. Their worth can be measured only by what they do for the child all through his life. Even if that could somehow be gathered up and counted, we still could not know what he might have developed of all these capacities and traits, had he had no schooling.

Special aspects of school business. It cannot be said that

education does not have its own special problems, or that we have any hope at all of developing a final means of measuring all the outcomes of education. Today society puts a high value upon certain qualities of character that reflect certain views of life; but history shows that these values shift with time and circumstances. The styles of hats and of morals both change; and so, if education means life, its goals must change. We may provide our children with moral attitudes, habits, and standards appropriate for today that may cause their children concern and their grandchildren chagrin. We all want a fixed, unchanging (safe and secure) world; but we cannot have that kind to live in. We educate toward our own ideal of a good world—perfect, secure, peaceful—and along comes a gasoline age and then, quickly, an atomic age, and many of education's older equipments fit our children badly or, it may be, not at all, for the life that they have to live.

Education, aware of the problem that this experience presents, is working hard to meet its challenges. The point here is that whatever we do in the realm of choosing instruction to fit these changing values, it still will be true that the school has to operate within and by the rules of our business economy. When, after a study of their educational values, we cannot choose which of two things to buy, we still have to face the fact of cost. Often comparison of these values can be illuminated by expressing each of them in terms of its cost. Thus it is that our most philosophical and scientific problems push us back into the realm of business and economy.

Keeping these values (economic as well as philosophical and scientific) in their proper places is a major aspect of the problem and process in all school administration. Along with the question of which of two articles or programs or procedures costs the more must be considered the question as to which of the two seems to offer the more in educational value at the price. School administration cannot ignore either.

What contribution to the subject matter and the science of

school administration, then, may we gain from a study of the business world? Thinking in terms of university curriculums, one would expect to find knowledge of the practices of business planning, budgeting of funds, purchasing, storing, contracts, building construction, business accounting, cost analysis, operation and maintenance of properties, and personnel work—together with the theories and principles underlying practice in schools of engineering, schools of business, commercial schools, and departments of economics.

What administration must have from these fields. Basic to an understanding of school management in this area would be a general understanding of economic theory—at least, the elements of accounting; good command of American history, with emphasis on social, industrial, and commercial developments; and some understanding of the elements of both public and private finance. If this could be a part of general education in the high school and early college courses, it should be possible, without distortion of the aims of general education, for those who were properly guided to add in the senior year a course in business law, a course in business organization and management, and work looking toward personnel management.

Thinking in terms of the literature and of developments in these areas—with which school administrators should be familiar—and of how education has made contact with what engineering and business have made available, one would recall at once the efficiency-engineering movement of the nineties. The school-survey movement, beginning in 1910, has reflected this same point of view and used many of the processes and techniques developed by such men as Frederick W. Taylor and his followers in the engineering profession. There is now an extensive literature[20] in the fields of business, engineering, and economics, in which one may

[20] For an excellent bibliography, covering the earlier literature of the engineering movement, see C. Bertrand Thompson, *The Theory and Practice of Scientific Management.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.

find explanations that cover almost every important phase of school business. The principles (and many of the processes) of budgeting for schools and of purchasing, of accounting, of debt financing, of personnel management, of plant maintenance and operation, of contracts, of insurance, of salary and wage scales, of payroll control, of storage and distribution of supplies, of inventories, of property records and accounts, of office management, of building construction, of (pupil) transportation, and other matters are not peculiar to any one kind of business.

Education should go to these sources for subject matter for two reasons. First, they contain basic and directly useful information; second, by exposure to this literature, a school executive would gain a closer knowledge of the business world. He should know the world of business, both because he is preparing children for life in that world and because, in his management of schools, he will have to participate in it as a responsible member. Any lack of understanding of business affairs generally will be reflected in shaky judgments and inadequate understanding of problems, which, in turn, may lead to loss of leadership with his board and community.

Our present books on school business administration are excellent. They show that their authors are well grounded in the science of business. Yet, although those books are not very old, their authors must see by now that they did too little by way of exposing the student to the literature here under discussion. In this case,. as in that of the subject matter to be drawn from political science, public administration, and law, education has not done the scientific groundwork, the basic research, in these fields. At best, education has explored special problems and areas, for which most of the basic work had been done before in these other sciences.[30] Our students should be sent to the fountain heads of this knowledge, from which they cannot fail to gain a firmer understanding of school business and, at

[30] On this point we have about enough exceptions to prove the rule.

the same time, to get what we have previously too much neglected to give them—a sense of belonging and of the schools' belonging to the world of business, government, and law, as a part of that world.

5. *Subject Matter from Anthropology and Sociology*

Education and culture. As a public service, education is devoted to the task of maintaining, recreating, and expanding what we call civilization. We are ever searching in the hope that we may make a science of civilization and so be able to predict changes and to manage it to attainable and desirable ends.[31]

The term civilization becomes less vague in meaning as one considers what enters into it—man himself, alone and with other men in society in a physical world; man, possessed of a nature subject to laws of its own and requiring that he feed, shelter, and protect himself and, these achieved, requiring further—or, at least, making possible—that he may express himself and be free to act, to think, to strive, to enjoy, alone and with others. In his effort to preserve his life and to apply his energies for the satisfaction of his higher needs, he develops what we call culture—tools, goods, homes, ships, and institutions involving organization for defense or religious activities or work or play or government. Further, he cultivates standards of behavior, beliefs, laws, customs, manners, language, economy, systems of knowledge; and in higher forms of society, he establishes schools, to keep all these interests, beliefs, processes, instruments, and material achievements alive. Some parts of a civilization result from man's purely animal effort to live and reproduce; other parts, from his applications of energy, intelligence, and taste to further satisfaction of basic and acquired wants.

What any given culture will be like at a given time will depend in part upon the biological background of the

[31] See Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

people; but much of that culture will depend upon climate, soil, presence of minerals, plants, and animal resources;[32] much, upon the size of the population in relation to food resources; much, upon relationships with neighboring societies. In any case, it will be an accumulation from the past and, besides tools and foods and manner of shelter, will include some scheme of government, some form of religion, some method of protection against enemies, some plan of economy, some system of medical care, some form of family life, some system of ethics—all made possible and operative by virtue of language, customs, traditions, and, at points perhaps, of fears and superstitions. Some of these things they may have invented or worked out for themselves, but many of them will have been borrowed from outside.[33]

In primitive cultures invention, discovery, and learning have but limited place as conscious purposes. Life is mainly static. Among savages, interest in progress is not a strong drive, and often evidence indicates that a slow process of cultural decay is at work, instead. Any culture that stands still is most likely to degenerate. Any society that tries for progress must, of necessity, keep trying. The school at first aimed most at conservation of culture, but with higher forms it has come to be an instrument of social progress—that is, progress in the sense of improving all that makes up its culture. The more complex the culture, the more complex the school, and also its management, must be. The school in a progressing society is a school that is constantly adjusting itself to cultural needs, constantly judging what part of the existing cultural elements should be conserved and passed down, what new cultural needs are apparent, and what new problems need solving in order that progress toward the cultural goals may be maintained.

[32] See Fairfield Osborn, *Our Plundered Planet.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1948.

[33] For a discussion of theories of culture and its spread see Lord Raglan, *How Came Civilization.* London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1939.

Education in some form is an element of every culture, as unavoidable as it is essential, and as much so when it is cause or effect in a primitive struggle for existence as it is in the most highly cultivated search for an understanding of the meaning of life itself. Most of what one sees as the tangible evidences of culture in any society is the accumulated product of learning. As one examines the processes of a culture, he sees education at work in relation to all the activities of man in society. As a feature of a culture, education never appears as a thing apart from or superior to, but always as an intimate part or aspect of, the culture; and, regardless of whether one views the education as purpose, as mechanism, as process, or as product, as individual behavior, or as an institution, this problem of how learning is related to living is a basic problem for a science of education. From a study of the way education behaves as an element in various cultures we may learn much about its objectives, much about its processes, and not a little about what its product has to be like—all of which we must understand if we are to administer it wisely.

Organization and management as elements of culture. Essential to social life everywhere and a part of it is the complex social mechanism by which the people live and work together. Organization in some form is apparent in all the phases of a culture for which common understanding and group effort are required. The principle of cooperation, the division-of-labor concept, and the planning for united effort find expression in their systems of government, their economic and engineering enterprises, and their cultural and religious institutions. Without a vast mechanism for social intercourse—language, manners, customs, traditions, rituals, laws, morals, social and aesthetic standards men could not live together. This social mechanism is never purely mechanical, even though it makes wide use of habits, beliefs, accepted moral standards, and social properties, which tend to make man's responses to situations approximately automatic. Not only in their origin and develop-

ment, but in their practical use, as well, these things reflect organized effort and with organization other elements of administration always appear. Usually there has been planning, there must be direction, there is some means of coordination, and there is control; with these there is some knowledge and, often, some authority. These are the elements that, combined, make up what we call administration. Administration, then, is an inevitable aspect of any culture and as, by learning, a culture becomes more complex, its need for administration is sure to grow. Thus, administration comes into being as other elements do, because it is an obvious and effective way of getting something done.

It is in the light of these facts that by a study of cultures one may hope to find something that is basic as an explanation, not only of the nature of education itself—the service to be administered—but also, of the function of administration. In the study of early cultures one can almost literally see these things being born. Where, then, could one find more essential data for a science of education and for a science of administration than in anthropology and sociology, where they are best known. This does not mean that the subjects now called sociology and cultural anthropology are inclusive of all that goes into a theory of education or all that is required for a theory of administration, but only that these sciences can contribute to the development of those theories. It is clear enough that the sciences of education and school administration cannot be developed without use of facts and principles from sociology and cultural anthropology.

The study of culture is, perhaps, the most inclusive of all the social studies as they are now organized. It views laws, constitutions, contracts, administration, occupations, dress, languages, tools, skills, institutions, social and economic processes, all functioning together to produce a society. Man is seen at work, not merely as an animal, but as an organizing, cooperating, purposeful, competing, managing, achieving, often creative, animal. Cross-section studies of

different levels of culture should bring to light how the elements of man's nature both qualify and cause him to try to administer, and reveal what kinds of needs may compel or invite his efforts at management, and in what ways attending circumstances may influence them. Such studies should provide some of the raw materials of a science of administration. Sociology has revealed much about the way men behave when living together in groups. Gradually, from these varied approaches, progress is being made toward a science of human behavior.

Induction into a culture is an experience in learning. To see the value of this approach to the study of administration, one has only to look carefully at the schools as they now operate. A few problems may serve for illustration. A child entering school for the first time faces the strange and difficult task of becoming a member of a new kind of society. Up to that time, he has known only how it feels to be a member of a family. This he learned very slowly, very directly, and over a long period of time. In learning it he could hardly have felt anything breaking into or competing with his former system of loyalties. The change from his mother's womb to the nursery was very great, but the child could hardly have been conscious of what was happening, except as he felt physical comfort or discomfort. But in the classroom and the school he faces the situation with a host of habits and attitudes and some knowledge, and with a personality that has been shaped in a very small, intimate, and familiar group life. The really important thing that the child will have to learn in his first few years is how to be a member of his school. To develop a sense of belonging in this new society is not an intellectual task only; it is largely social and psychological. When the child enters high school, he faces this same task again in a lesser way. He must face it later when he enters college, and still again in some respects when he enters upon his career, when he casts his first vote, when he joins religious or social or political groups, when he is married and establishes a home, and

when he becomes a parent. Always, he is learning how to be a member.

Anthropology and sociology have shown us how these kinds of learning have been achieved—how men have learned to live together under many and varied conditions. Nowhere is there such a clear picture of the way this takes place as that offered by scholars who have studied cultures as wholes, and not apart from but within their physical environments. Students of education have approached this problem from several angles—biological, psychological, social, physical, and educational—each of which has much to offer; but it has failed most often in its effort to consolidate these into the single picture that represents the special approach of the anthropologist. Yet we know that, to be well adjusted, the child must build himself into the school as a whole and feel that it is his school. Surely this is a concern of management.

Again, who needs a clearer picture of the way a society is constructed than the one who must shape its organization and direct it? In school administration we organize classes, grades, schools, major groups of schools based on curriculums, school systems; we have parent-teacher, faculty, and student organizations of many sorts. The school must deal with the family, with the municipality, the county, the state, the police, the courts, the church. In other words, the school is a highly organized institution and it operates among and is related to other institutions. It must be closely a part of the total culture and not isolated from or in conflict with other units of that culture. If our schools are to exercise leadership in shaping cultural trends, they must not try to do this without understanding the whole culture, of which they are but one small part.

One cannot study primitive and more advanced cultures side by side without seeing how their various social structures have been built up in terms of human natures and physical and social environments. A primitive people's organization for government or religion or trade, its institu-

tions of marriage and family, its games, its rituals, all are evolved slowly in answer to what the people want or think they need. They probably reason but little about them as they come into being. These social structures grow out of the life that the people live. Once developed, an institution, a belief, or a form of dress may be handed down as a tradition and be retained long after it has ceased to be useful. Nevertheless, its origin was closely related to the facts and circumstances of life. At their beginnings these organizations were means and not ends. There is always a functional relationship between organization, or any item of culture, and the circumstances under which it is born. So, a study of these relationships can help any student of administration to see in their origins many parallels that will guide his thought about school organization.

Administration may draw upon studies of society for ideas. Suppose that one is preparing a set of rules and regulations for a school system. Besides considering organization, he must be concerned with purposes, policies, standards, procedures, and routines for governing the schools. This body of laws is the central instrument of control, but not the whole scheme of government. Above it there are superior laws; below it there is public opinion; and there is, also, our system of professional ethics and social usage that we can rely upon. What anthropology has learned about social control through public opinion and how public opinion can grow into laws and government structures, how it is related to beliefs, traditions, social pressures, and geographical circumstances can be very illuminating.

Under present conditions, we frequently find clashes between school administrators and teachers. Why is this? Someone in the case must have a wrong idea of the process of management. Probably it is true that our studies and teaching of administration have approached their work mainly from the viewpoint of the work to be done and the kinds of actions and decisions needed; and that less thought has been given to what happens, as a result, to those who

are affected by the decisions. We tend rather often, too, to judge administration by what it plans and intends to do, and by part rather than all of its results. Further, the results of an order may appear excellent on the surface and not reveal a submerged sense of disappointment that may grow to discontent or even distrust and, later, to open antagonism. The authority implicit in the order, or in the method by which the order was given, may have operated as a threat and checked a reaction that good administration would have preferred to have expressed. Administration involves the behavior of those who receive and execute orders as truly as it does that of those who formulate and give them.

This idea of administration's being two-sided must be carried a step further if we are to see how a knowledge of culture is basic to an understanding of its nature.[34] If administration is one element in a complex of human behavior in a society, then it must have been formed to its purposes in the presence of other elements of the culture, sometimes in conflict and again in cooperation with, and always largely by the process of trial and error and success. Its nature could not have been given to it ready-made, but only as a resultant of the interplay of many factors. To make it a function in society, therefore, its several elements must have been shaped together. Authority, knowledge, organization, direction, planning, coordination, and control came into action as the several aspects of a general group effort to get work done, and not often with each functioning as a separate, independent, readymade whole. Surely nothing could have got into the process and survived that did not have value in the case, nothing could have been done by administration that lacked the sanction of the people who were being directed or of the society affected. Also, turning this round, things that would be likely to get into the

[34] Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Background of Personality*. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1945. See, especially, Chap. 3 on social structure and cultural participation.

administrative process would be things thought of and recognized as having value or as being already known and accepted. In other words, experiences that were drawn upon in the effort to manage would be drawn in the light of attending circumstances from the general fund of group experience and would be applied with such insight and judgment as was available. A bright leader might think of how he once captured game and, by a bit of creative intelligence, might turn that experience to account in trying to battle an enemy, thus giving birth to the element of planning in management.

Professional ethics a force in administration. In school administration we speak of our professional ethics. This ethics embodies the general philosophy of life that underlies our social order and concretes its own principles by specifying types of conduct that are accepted as representing principles from that philosophy.[35] Similarly, in administration we formulate policies and establish forms and routines of life and work for the school. Each policy embodies a principle of action. In viewing any set of school policies, one can always detect these underlying principles behind the more specific governmental specifications. Principles such as those of fairness, justice, freedom of expression, respect for the individual, respect for established customs and proprieties—all, principles of human conduct, principles that are born of social life and implicit everywhere in our cultural fiber—these are the terms by which our laws,

[35] Here we are thinking in terms of the concept of democracy by which our culture is constructed. We do not forget de Montesquieu's wise comment, "The laws of education ought to be relevant to the laws of government." "The laws of education will be therefore different in each species of government; in monarchies they will have honor for their object; in republics, virtue; in despotic governments, fear." *The Spirit of Laws,* Vol. I, p. 42. On page 108 of the same volume he says: "In republican governments men are all equal; equal they are also in despotic governments; in the former because they are everything, in the latter because they are nothing." London: Printed for J. Mourse and P. Vaillant, 1752.

our rules and orders, our policies are to be formed and interpreted.

If it is true that administration can or that it must use in its work many of the principles that operate in forming and in carrying on the daily-life activities in our culture, it is clear that students of administration will understand those principles better if they see them at work as elements in the culture about them and know how they appear and operate in other cultures. The importance of this conclusion is driven home with convincing force by many of the great studies of cultures, some of which have greatly influenced the building of our own America.[36]

Where, for instance, could one go for greater assurance that this idea can be made fruitful in teaching administration than to the monumental work of Arnold J. Toynbee, who has in a manner "put Humpty Dumpty together again" by examining history as made up of societies rather than of states, and as shaped by a complex of many social as well as physical forces, not just by military campaigns or dates or kings? If Toynbee overstresses the power of environment in shaping societies, as some of his critics think, at least he helps one to deal with cultural wholes. The things, the principles, the forces by which he explains history are extracted from the nature of societies and their environments and are demonstrated to have reality as explanations of societies, when applied as reasons for the cultural developments and changes found. His explanation of this is developed through one age after another and in one part of the world after another. Men fool themselves by thinking that civilizations and institutions are but passive objects or substance to be shaped by political or military power, instead of active forces engaged in their own creation or recreation, with laws of their own that in part derive from and broadly harmonize with the laws of human biology,

[36] Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* is a good illustration. The World's Great Classics Edition, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1899.

human society, and geography. Man is not apart from the beliefs, the fears, the superstitions, the moral standards he holds; he is not apart from the system of proprieties, conventions, customs, and traditions of his people. Neither can one grow to manhood and not have these as elements of his character; his behavior as a leader or as a follower is formed in part by these social elements that play so strong a role in the shaping of his personality and his character.

Cultural anthropology, sociology, and social psychology have a wealth of material mined out. It remains for administration to study these materials and from them to extract what can be used to help explain the school and its management. Toynbee's work has been mentioned. There are other convincing demonstrations of the use of this idea. Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America,* to which reference has already been made—especially, the second volume—affords material for a liberal education in the method of analysis by which the management of cultures can be examined for their bearing upon the nature of the society as a whole, in this case a democratic society at work. De Montesquieu, in *The Spirit of Laws,* proceeds in like manner with his study of the nature of laws. Everywhere he examines the law in the light of what nature has already provided as a control and in the light of what social or physical circumstances seem to require. One cannot study the methods used or the data examined or the conclusions of these and many similar great studies of societies without gaining insight into the problems and into the nature of administration.

6. *Subject Matter from the Field of Psychology*

Administration as behavior. Administration is a form of human behavior. Of itself, it is partly individual and partly social in nature, seldom or never one without the other; it is rational—in part, at least—but usually it is tinged with, sometimes dominated by, the emotions, and much of it involves some physical activity. All of what we think of as

the cultural process is the same. It is rational, emotional, and physical in nature; and no study can fathom its meaning and not be concerned as much with psychological as with social, biological, and mechanical phenomena. Man is a knowing and feeling, as well as a social or a political, animal. If the nature of administration can be illuminated by studying it as an aspect or expression or sample of culture, it can be clarified also, by studying it as individual behavior.

Behavior is both individual and social. As social conduct, administration has to be thought of from two standpoints. There are recipients as well as givers of orders; and often, on the side, there are third or even fourth parties with varying interests in any orders that are given. All these parties participate in any complete act of administration, each playing his special role. A superintendent calls a meeting of subexecutives. Together they formulate a plan of action. The plan is passed to and executed by teachers, who give its directions to the children. The children, in turn, report their new requirements at home, causing a change in the breakfast routine of the family. That an administrative act may not cause the second or the third party to react until months later does not alter the fact that an administrative act is a social act and is not completed until all its direct and indirect effects have been felt and responded to. This may include hidden and unexpressed feelings that accumulate, to erupt weeks afterward. Preparing a decision may be the task of one person; but in making the decision, that person will almost certainly take account of the possible reactions of those to be affected by the decision. The decision is but a segment of the total act and, in a strict sense, may be administratively nonexistent until it is given out, where-upon others begin to react to it. That is, administrative energy begins to flow and to cause work to be done.

Formulating a decision might possibly be a purely individual act and a purely intellectual act; but one can rarely separate from such a task his own personal feelings, tastes,

prejudices and doubts, or his wishes to satisfy some competing desires or needs, or his reluctance to bring the effects of the decision to bear upon those whom it may affect adversely. To make an administrative decision is to think of self in relation to others, as well as to think of the ways and means of accomplishing desirable educational ends. It involves intelligence, but intelligence as a part of a total personality that acts not only as it knows, but also as it feels. Feelings are bound up with habits, attitudes, beliefs, prejudices, fears, loves, and hates; and sometimes, in a decision, these forces may prevail against knowledge.

Regardless of what combination of knowing and feeling may enter the case, regardless of whether we think of a single part or of the total cycle of activity, what we are dealing with is as much a problem of individual psychology as of social behavior, which is itself psychological in nature.

Administration and the learning process. A second approach to this problem will make it equally clear that administrators must know some psychology. In the present case, we are concerned with the administration of education. The reason for the existence of any administrative act is that it facilitates learning. This it may do quite directly, as by establishing procedures, modes of life, or routines of work or play that constantly evoke desirable learning responses from the children; or indirectly, as by sound financing, good housing, effective school organization, a suitable program, good public-relations services, or sound staff morale. The line that divides administration from teaching is difficult to find and to define, because the two functions must come together as two phases of a single task. We think of purchasing as administrative work and of telling the children what paper to use in a given exercise as instructional work. The purchasing agent knows the paper market, including kinds, qualities, and prices of paper; the teacher knows children and how they learn and also knows the uses of paper in teaching. The one knows paper in one way (economic); the other, in an equally or more important but

different way (psychological). The latter must decide what shall be used, how much will be needed, and when it must be on hand; the former must find that paper in the market at the best price, must buy it, and must have it delivered in time.

In teaching, one may have paper needs for which he knows no existing kinds of paper; in purchasing, one may come upon types of paper that have not been ordered but that seem to be of value in teaching. Clearly, here is an administrative problem of how to bring these two funds of information together so that the purchaser can search the market in terms of educational needs, and so that the teacher may examine existing new and unknown possibilities of meeting instructional needs.

Administration and the teaching process. At its teaching end, we have to know the psychology of learning in order to judge what paper to use; for teaching must be in terms of the laws of learning. If the administrator knows too little about learning and teaching, he may do his buying in economic terms only. This is by no means uncommon practice.

The extent to which this idea—that administration must take account of learning—applies can be seen by examining the important administrative task of budget making. By sound principles the school budget is a financial expression of a year's program of educational activities. In the development of this program, decision has to be made (1) as to instructional objectives for all the children as they are grouped for instruction, for play, and for health and safety and care; (2) as to what activities will be undertaken to attain the objectives; (3) as to what supplies and equipment and alterations of living conditions will have to be provided. If the best possible talent available is used in the preparation of this program, it will include those who know the psychology of instruction, as well as those who know enrollment figures, business, and economics. Unless an administrator has some understanding of the problem, the budget will likely not be made in this way.

The problem of school organization is an administrative problem; but the grouping of children must take account of the requirements of instruction. Instruction is not quite as individual in nature as is learning, but it is economy to group children with regard for the particular kinds of care and instruction that they need. Instruction is concerned with the child's physical well-being and development, with his intellectual needs and capacities, and with his personality problems. The first are not without psychological bearings, the second and third are essentially psychological. Accordingly, the classification of children; the development of grade, department, and school groups; the provision for health care; the segregation of children for special care or instruction—each with many ramifications and variations—suggest how psychology helps to solve organization problems.

The planning and directing of programs of activities reflect this same need as a basis for the organization of what children study and of what and how they play, of what social activities they have, and of what the routine of their daily life shall be, with its system of manners and morals and proprieties. In all this, one must take careful account of how children learn facts and principles, how they learn emotional control, and how they improve in taste. Often, too, organization takes account of abnormalities—that is, of replacing detrimental habits, attitudes, beliefs, manners, and speech forms. It was largely the study of psychology, for instance, that laid the foundation for the program of guidance and student counseling. Administration found this problem in the form of discipline cases, disturbed personalities, and failures in achievement; but when it undertook to diagnose the conditions, psychology was called in. Another way in which administration has used psychology in organization is seen in the changes that have come about in the field of supervision. In early times, supervision was so connected with administration that there was no separation of the two in practice. The result was dislike of supervision by the teachers, for whose benefit it had been in-

stituted. Later analysis revealed that supervision could accomplish its ends through advice, leadership, and instruction, but would defeat them by use of authority. Slowly we came to the practice of supervision without authority to command. Supervision at once became highly responsible and friendly—the supervisor, a copartner with the teacher in the joint task of improving instruction. The point is that law cannot compel teachers to learn, but that experts can help them if they approach the task as equals in authority and work through common purpose and in friendly joint effort.

Administrative authority recognizes science and public will. All this brings to light a principle of administration, *viz.*, that in managerial work authority has a limited sphere in which to serve. Authority can lead a horse to water but cannot make him drink. In the realm of drinking—in education this is a wide realm—the power that commands is not the authority of law or regulation, but that of knowledge and will or, often, the pressure of custom, public opinion, or professional ethics. The reason for this lies not in the weakness of law, but in the strength of human personality and the power of logic and fact. This principle, if it may be called a principle, thus becomes a guide to action wherever administration operates to direct people or moves in a manner that affects people.

The applications of this principle are many and varied. Use of it calls for a thorough understanding of the administrative process. Perhaps one might say of authority, "Never use it when knowledge or social force can be used." This would not be safe, however, for the reason that deferred effects of failure to use authority can be quite as important as deferred effects of the misuse of it. The point is that each of these forms of energy—legal, scientific, and social—has its proper place in the process of getting managerial work done. It is the responsibility of administration to apply the right form of energy to each task. To do this, account will have to be taken of human nature and of society, as well as of legal authority.

For illustration, take the question of staff morale. Some administrators try to maintain morale with stress upon authority; others stress the use of social force (some mainly by "backslapping," some by manipulating leadership, some by shaping public opinion); and some stress interest in the knowledge of and devotion to the work to be done. It is clear that, if authority tries to compel a group of uncongenial people to work cooperatively in dealing with the welfare of children, it will not succeed well. It is clear that the backslapper fools some people into believing they are far better than they are in their work; that he shields the lazy, who seize upon the chance to substitute smiles for work; and that he almost certainly prevents the professional growth of both. It is equally clear that morale that is centered in a common purpose and that works with full and common knowledge and by commonly accepted ideals toward its goals of service will be lasting and dependable. The difference between good and bad, here, lies in the fact that in the one case morale is a sham or, if it is morale at all, it is morale to some end other than that of instruction; while in the other case morale is self-made, its power to hold the group together is from within, it is a result and not a cause. The results of morale achieved by administrative compulsion are fear, many nettled dispositions, joint but unwilling effort. The results of backslapping are mainly a sense of security tinged by fear that things might change, or sometimes they are little jealousies that lead to factional strife and, at best, to a hilarious time for some—but with a consciousness of professional insincerity—and to a sense of defeat by others. The results of morale by professional work are never resentment by any except those who should be excluded anyway; it produces a sense of professional comradeship, which in turn is the very soundest possible foundation for social solidarity and enjoyment; and it gets educational work done.

One does not need to use psychological terminology to classify parts of this as social psychology, other parts as the psychology of personality, or of learning; to see that the

administrative process by which one selects the good from the bad in planning, in organizing, in directing, and in coordinating effort toward effecting sound morale can be understood only if one knows the psychology that is so obviously an essential element in the task.

In like analysis of such administrative problems as are faced in the field of public relations, in the development of pupil self-government, in managing staff and committee meetings, in carrying on the in-service education program, in working with a board of education when shaping new policies, in problems of reorganization, in the development of salary schedules or retirement plans—in fact, in almost any problem—one finds psychological factors at almost every turn. These factors are very stubborn facts for management, and ignorance of them is at the root of much administrative failure.

What psychology is needed. If from this analysis one were to try to sum up what of psychology an administrator should know, it would start with a broad course covering the field as a whole and provide general orientation regarding the nature of the study, the place of such knowledge in our scheme of life, and the way it has been developed; it would show how the field has been laid out for study—as experimental psychology, psychology of learning, clinical psychology, child psychology, social psychology, psychology of personality, etc.—and it would include sufficient exposure to the literature of the fields to provide general orientation. This should be a part of a student's general education. Beyond that, it would seem to require special work in the psychology of learning, of testing, of personality, of childhood and adolescence, and of abnormal and social psychology.

Obviously, this is an extended program, for which a smattering, hodgepodge course would not be adequate. It could not be taught incidentally, while it was being applied in the study of administrative problems. It should be learned before the student has gone far in the study of administra-

tion, so that it can be drawn upon to explain the administrative problems in which psychology would be a phase.

Diagnosis precedes prescription. The point to stress here is that teaching administration is not accomplished merely by teaching patterns of procedure. Administration is much more than a collection of techniques and forms and recipes. One may learn all the patterns of organization known and still be very ignorant of how to determine which pattern is appropriate to use in a given case. How to find out how to administer is as important as administering itself. One should not treat a case until he has diagnosed it. In school administration there are not very many problems in which psychological factors are lacking, and diagnosis would call for ability to recognize and to deal with those factors.

Psychology explains the education we administer. As a second approach to this problem, account has to be taken of the part that psychology plays in the science of education. To study administration without a knowledge of education itself (the service to be administered) is unthinkable. Accordingly, the administrator must study psychology, first, in order to understand the service he is to administer; and second, in order to understand the nature of the process of management. If general education has provided broad orientation in the field, as was suggested above, the student should be prepared to extend that knowledge in the light of the two purposes here noted: the psychology of childhood and youth, of learning, personality development, teaching, care, and discipline; and the psychology of administration—personnel management, public relations, organization, direction, coordination, control, policy forming, planning.

The former group of these areas is covered by courses in educational psychology and testing with extensions of the foundation work in the fields of abnormal, personality, and clinical psychology. The latter areas have not been so directly faced as yet, though it is becoming clearer that there is such a possibility. As yet, we cannot speak of the psy-

chology of administration as we do of the psychology of learning or teaching or testing. In the process of administration there is much that is identical with what we find in the processes of learning and teaching, in our studies of interest and effort, or of fear, anger, disgust, envy, and jealousy. Social psychology offers much that bears directly, but so far we have not undertaken a psychological analysis of a series of typical administrative problems. If psychological explanations of administrative work can be found in the present science of psychology, as many of them surely can be, then we have only the task of bringing these facts and principles together, as such. When this has been done, it should be possible to locate any unexplained portions and to start researches in those areas. Gradually, the place of psychology in the subject matter of administration would come to light.

Knowledge of psychology does not function alone in administration. In making an administrative decision or in giving an order, one is guided in part by law, in part by science or knowledge, in part by social proprieties or public opinion. If the recipient of an order notes the absence of any one of these three elements, his reaction to the order is most likely to be less than wholehearted. If administration is to be good, account must be taken of the possible psychological effects of the act. A decision may be legal, entirely just, scientifically sound, yet be offensive to those affected by it; because, by the method of either its development or its announcement, it neglected to show a proper recognition of the intelligence and desires of those who are to make it effective.

The ability to anticipate how people will behave may require something more than an understanding of the psychology involved; yet there is little gained by being an artist at giving orders if one is an ignoramus at guessing what responses his orders will evoke.

Chapter 14. SUMMARY WITH A LOOK AHEAD AS TO SUBJECT MATTER FOR THIS FIELD

Parts I and II of this book have attempted to throw light upon the nature of the administrative process and upon the nature of the various forms of power that energize the process. Part III is an extension of these studies of administration, knowledge being one of the four kinds of energy examined in Part II. In Part II the inquiry was more concerned with why and how knowledge functions than with what this knowledge would include and where and how it might be obtained. Parts I and II were searching for a theory of administration; Part III, for a theory of the subject matter for that field. The former reveal, or at least suggest, the general character and scope of what one must know in order to apply the power of suitable knowledge to the task of administering public education; the latter attempts to indicate what this knowledge must include, where it comes from and, in some measure, how it can be organized for the use of one who is to learn or to teach the subject. This latter part is intended to throw further light upon the behavior of knowledge as administrative power, to stress the necessity for the administrator's being always an active learner on the job, and to provide a basis for the selection and arrangement of materials that would constitute the proper subject matter of the field.

This final chapter attempts to sum up the reasoning on the question of subject matter and to undertake a brief look at what, for the science and philosophy of school administra-

tion, appears to be unfinished business. The background of our experience, the criteria by which materials (facts, ideas, attitudes, skills, personality traits) become subject matter, the sources of necessary materials and why, and the principles and concepts by which materials from each of the areas treated in Chap. 13 are drawn, are briefly restated.

In the look ahead, attempt is made to bring together the points of weakness in practice that are brought to light throughout the book. Noted as points of attack for the student of tomorrow are the following: wrong basic concepts of the nature of administrative power or their misuse; confusion of personal with official rights; mistaken notions of democracy; unwillingness to formulate and use regulations that bind administrators, teachers, and clerks, alike; failure to find or to grasp, or willingness to dodge, the clear implications of educational facts and principles in the case; lack of clarity as to the ultimate values sought; stressing the learning of devices and tricks of the trade as substitutes for a knowledge of the science and philosophy of administration—all with their implications for sound management. Facts known only in isolation must be given perspective by a fuller development and more careful application of our theory of public education to practice. We need to revise the recipes and gadgets of administration in the light of a more thorough knowledge of children, of society and culture, of law, of learning and the schools themselves. We must know our world and our culture if we are to school children to live in it; we must know education if we are to administer schools.

Summary of Part III

Purposes of this study. This study has attempted to clarify our thoughts and perhaps to throw some new light upon three problems: What is the nature of the subject matter of public school administration? By what criteria may suitable items of this subject matter be selected? From what sources must these materials be drawn?

Historical background. A review of the literature on these problems and of the developments of school administration as a practice, as a science, and as a university subject, served to remind us that, in spite of our half century of rapid development of schools, our excellent scientific studies, our extensive literature in the field, and our many courses and textbooks on the subject, we have not a great deal to show in the way of careful studies of these three problems. As the study has proceeded, there has been occasion for reviewing what has been done along these lines in the fields of public administration, administrative law, and business administration. The conclusion reached is that these have been live questions in all these fields and that students in any one field could profit by the study of what is being done in the other fields, but that in all alike there is need for studies much more thorough than those that have been made.

Criteria of subject matter. It was reasoned that a study of these problems must begin with the question of what subject matter is, and then must consider what it is for the particular field in question. Anything is subject matter only if it is useful and is used in promoting learning. That is, in the choice of things to study, account has to be taken also of the student—what does he wish to learn and what has he the ability to learn? Then, as here, if one wishes to learn administration, there is the question concerning of what administration is made up. Clearly an understanding of administration would involve facts and principles, but beyond these it would require many skills, with judgment, will, personality, imagination, and physique, as well. So, the task for subject matter here is to provide appropriate knowledge, including the methods and techniques of developing and using knowledge, as well as assistance in producing the skills, the character, personality, and physique required in the administrative process. This is merely saying that, because administration is an art as well as a science, its subject matter must include much more than the science of administration. Explanations of skills would direct study

and focus attention, but the study would need to include study of performance, of the self at work—that is, exercise, behavior, practice, responsible use of personality traits.

By this reasoning one arrives at the "demands of the job" as the basis for choosing subject matter, the demands in any given case depending upon the nature and capacity of the learner, as well as upon the nature of the job itself. This does not provide our criteria· of subject matter, but only tells us where to look for them. It affords some clues by which to identify the subject matter, however, even though it leaves us with the task of determining what is and what is not a part of administration.

Inquiry as to the nature of administration brought out the point that public schools, being created by the state, must be administered by means of laws; that learning, being strictly an individual matter, must be managed with some regard for the laws of learning and for individual differences. Thus the government of schools by law must be paralleled by and interlocked with government by science (knowledge of child nature and of the laws of learning, health, personality, and physical development). Thus administration must be in part by law and in part by discretion.

When management is discretionary, there is the possibility that authority may be used for other than appropriate ends. This form of abuse, everywhere so common, called our attention to the concept of autocracy as a concept in administration, a concept that is directly opposite to the idea that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the job. Examination of this idea further clarified our search for our criteria in two ways: (1) Our administration subject matter has to reckon with the danger that the democratic concept may be set aside by an opposite philosophy; (2) our analysis of the administrative process is to be guided by the social and political philosophy that brought the schools into existence. Not only must administration choose the right, but it must be equipped to oppose the wrong.

Sources of subject matter. Besides the fact that the

nature of administration is determined in part by the nature of the state, in part by laws and discretionary authority, and in part by the nature of the learner, it is obvious that, if we are to have schools, provision must be made for housing, for supplies and equipment, and for expert services—all of which indicate a direct contact with the practices and responsibilities of business and economy. Nor is this all that we have by which to guide our study of administration. There is the question of social, as well as of individual, goals of education. Our state is the people, and presumably it exists not merely to keep order and to promote justice, but also to promote the good life for all. This social interest is as real for our public education as is the individual interest. We can no more think of an individual out of a society than we can think of a society without individuals. The words culture and civilization suggest the wide scope of this social interest. The school educates the child, as an individual, but always within the limits and in terms of the culture, the civilization, of our people, striving always for the best and often reaching beyond the attainments of the past, but limited always by the language, the customs, the traditions, the ideals, and the tastes, that come out of the past.

If school administration is thus concerned with the nature of our state, of our culture, of our society, of our economy, of the child for whom the schools exist, then it follows that for a full knowledge of public school administration one must know something of the sciences that explain these several fields—of political science, law, economics and business, psychology and biology, and anthropology and sociology.

This reasoning did not indicate that administration is not something in itself, that materials from these sources would add up to the total "nature of the job," but only that the administration of schools must be consistent in purpose and principle with the philosophy and science of these fields. This conclusion served to indicate certain definite areas to be studied for what light each might throw upon the "nature

of the job" and roughly to suggest what administration would need from each.

The next step was concerned with how to go about the task of assembling these materials. Reasoning upon this can be summed up as follows: School administration being both science and art, its subject matter must provide the knowledge essential to an understanding of our plan of public education in all its aspects and, with this, directions for activities that will result in the development of the personality and skills essential to the work; though one could begin with the political origin of our schools and proceed by deductive reasoning through their conception, formation, and operation, it seemed more effective and direct to reverse this, beginning with the children to be educated or with schools as they exist and, from the problems met with, to determine what facts and principles we need from these outside fields to guide us. This was to suggest a method of working at the task of assembling our subject matter, not necessarily an arrangement of it for presentation. By this approach one would begin with a study of administration at work. For each administrative problem, and at each step, he would think, first, in terms of what the science of learning and teaching might offer, or require in the case; second, in terms of our political and social philosophy and our laws covering education; third, in terms of the rules and practices of our economy; and finally, in terms of the cultural needs and outlook and processes of the people as these are reflected in the traditions, public opinion, and social standards, of the people concerned. Following these preliminaries, some analysis was made of the administrative process itself and, following this, each of these outside fields was examined for what contribution it could make to an explanation of administration.

Subject matter of administration. Starting with the idea that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the process of individual learning, the nature of our culture (including especially our government, our laws, our system

of economy), and the capacity of the administrator, it is reasoned that administration is not a mechanism or a system with laws inherent in itself, but is derived from a study of the service it is to manage. It begins with study, not with a rule ready to impose. Having evolved a plan of action, it then directs execution of the plan. With the process of execution under way, further study notes weaknesses and effects coordinations. Finally, results are studied and the entire scheme is revised. Thus, administration is something to be discovered—something to be drawn out of the "nature of the job."

This conception of administration must be made a fact for study, because it must be our insurance against the opposite concept, autocracy, wherein administration is a system or a force ready-made, self-powered, self-guided, self-imposed, and responsible to itself only.

How to extract administration from the "nature of the job" is the next problem in building a subject matter. This has been considered at some length. It was suggested that one may think of administration as mechanism, as process, as authority, or as a practical problem or task to be performed. The importance of each of these for what it reveals of the nature of administration was examined. The fourth approach seemed the most inclusive and the most likely to keep attention focused upon essentials, that is, upon the goal sought, the work to be done, and the ways and means of doing it. It seemed to assure that problems would be faced in terms of what the laws of learning, of health, and of character development called for, and that authority would be used to instrument the requirements of science and not for other ends.

The implications of this view for the subject matter of administration are very wide. The administrator must know how children learn and how and what teachers teach. He would need to see his problems in the light of our cultural trends, in the light of the purposes of our people and of the aims and needs of our government.

Public administration as a source. Contact of school administration with political science was argued as follows: By the existence of public schools, education is established as a purpose and function of the state. The nature and purposes of school service must, therefore, have been conceived as a means of achieving one of the ends for which the state itself was established. This not only implies that, by its origin, the philosophy of public school administration derives from the philosophy of our government, but also that the administration of our schools is a part of our scheme of public administration. With this connection between schools and government, it is apparent that in the practical management of the two there must be many parallels in purpose, in organization, in principles, in techniques, and in procedures, and many ways in which each of the two should take account of the other.

If the science of education is to be respected in school management, the school must, in that far, be free to act on its own—be, in fact, the state, or that part of the state which provides school service.

With such relationships in theory and in practice, it seems certain that a study of school administration must in many ways be no more than the study of a special branch of public administration. For two reasons these connections, these common elements, should be understood both by students of government and by students of schools. First, however independent each function, each service, each arm of the state may need to be, it is nonetheless a part of the larger whole and is responsible for functioning in harmony with the other parts. Second, if administration has any possibilities of being a science, there must be principles of administration as appropriate to the management of one branch of the government as to another. Further, it should be an obligation of school administration to assist in the discovery and explanation of these common principles. Factual connections between schools and government, which were noted at length, are too obvious and numerous to require

more than mention here. Thus does school administration both stem from and extend the realm of political science.

Law as a source. Law as a source of subject matter for school administration is both direct and indirect. The school is established and must operate by laws. School law is thus a part of the body of fact by which the management of schools is shaped and controlled. But this is not the sole interest in law for the student of school administration. Law can actually guide action only in so far as it can prescribe for action. Education is itself a science, which our laws try to respect by not prescribing when right action cannot be foreseen. In dealing with children, education is faced with wide individual differences as to capacity and need and with wide variation in surrounding circumstances, which, in their special bearing, have also to be respected. Accordingly, law must provide for discretionary power to deal with these variables. This opens the question of the nature of such authority, of how to use it, and of the possibilities of a misuse of it.

The subject matter for school law, as such, can be prepared from a study of constitutional provisions, of school codes, of administrative and court decisions, and of special rules and regulations, all of which are tangible in form and readily available for study. For a study of discretionary authority, the task is far more difficult. This form of authority is in process of growth as a feature of our government. Its nature and use are extremely varied as one sees it at work in the many administrative tribunals, commissions, and boards of our government. Among legal scholars there are widely different views as to the nature and proper use of this kind of authority. Since much of school government has to be exercised by discretion, school administrators should be conversant with the great changes that are being made in our form of government in this respect and with the growing literature that is being produced on the subject. This literature is coming from two important sources: on the one hand, from scholars who know the nature of law and,

on the other, from administrators who know the practical problems and pressures of government. Out of this study there must evolve a clearer understanding of the administrative function and to it school administrators should make some contribution.

Engineering and business as a source. The contacts of schools with the world of business are direct and obvious and already we have extensive treatises covering these problems. The school is of the nature of a corporation. It must obtain and operate and care for properties, it must possess and exercise rights and responsibilities pertaining to its properties, it must contract for services, it must use and account for moneys. It purchases, sells, and employs in open markets, as does any business corporation.

School business differs from private business in some few respects. The school can exercise the power of eminent domain, which private individuals cannot do. By this method the school can always purchase at a fair price, regardless of the state of the market. This is less important as a special economic right than as a right to get the property needed by the schools and get it at the time it is needed. The other major difference is that for the schools the chief end sought is service, whereas in private economy the chief end is profit. In both there are other considerations. In private economy men seek power, social prestige, political advantage, fame, personal pleasure; but usually these ends do not run counter to that of economic gain or to what, it is believed, can be turned later to such gain. Similarly, in school business these same motives must operate to some extent, since schools are run by human beings; but what is more important, the school cannot disregard either the processes or the values of private economy. A school board may purchase service or properties for use in service, but it cannot hold the respect and esteem of the community if in such purchases it does not apply the accepted rules of economy.

Accumulation of knowledge of these matters has been the object of scholars in economics, engineering, business,

private and public finance accounting, and many related fields. To these fields education must go for aid in developing subject matter suited to the fullest explanation of public school business.

Sociology and anthropology as a source. The study of societies was shown to be essential to an understanding of public school administration, though the approach to this field was somewhat different. First, it was shown that public school administration is itself a social process and can function best only if it is consistent with the laws and values by which our civilization is designed and carried on. Second, study of our culture is essential because education, the service to be administered, is devoted to the preservation, enjoyment, and growth of that culture and, furthermore, the school is itself a feature of that culture.

Our culture is not a thing apart from, but is a part of, ourselves as individuals. The only language we have is a social instrument; the manners and proprieties we use are social devices; honor and integrity and morality are social in nature. Yet, for us all these are parts, also, of our personalities. How could learning, teaching, or management ignore the laws or the facts by which our culture has been developed? How could the school be an institution for instruction without arranging for the children to use, to live (as well as learn) this culture? How could the school be organized, directed, controlled, except in terms of the social values that have a status in our culture?

These ideas were tested out somewhat for their worth in our study of the nature of the administrative process. How authority came into its place through the instrumentality of laws and through the discretion of executives is a long story of how our ways of dealing have been built up. Only by a study of the process of their evolution as social forces, social values, social devices, can we really know best how to form or to use them or how to reshape them to fit new needs.

For this kind of knowledge school administration can and must go to the social sciences, where already there are vast

accumulations of knowledge that can be used to throw light upon the nature of school administration from these angles.

Psychology as a source. The importance of psychology and biology for school administration was shown to rest upon the same grounds as those just used to reveal how the social sciences help to explain the nature and many of the problems of administration. The studies of mental, emotional, and aesthetic phenomena, together with their biological bases, are necessary for understanding how children learn, how character and personality develop, and how social life is related to individual life. At school the child is an individual, but he is or is becoming a member of a little society. School organization and management are intended to facilitate both individual and social learning. This they can hope to do only if they understand how children live, learn, develop personalities, and become members of groups.

It is true that one objective of administrative action in developing the school plant is to provide shelter, that another is to facilitate the care and control of the children; but in achieving these ends, it is an aim also, not to house or to arrange living conditions in a manner that will interfere with or, where possible, fail to facilitate all desirable forms of learning, along with personal and social care and development. Similarly, in working out the managerial routines or the daily regimen of life for a school, the end is not restraints or coercions but government that is far more positive in purpose, that aims "*to direct with a view to producing learnings.*" Thus it is a function of school administration so to perform its duties that it stimulates and directs but does not compel desirable learnings.

The principles thus developed apply with equal force within the administrative process itself. The administrative process is not a scientific process alone; it is also human conduct. Objective facts, as well as rules and principles or policies, can be applied in administration only through the acts of people. It was argued that the administrative func-

tion is best understood as a cycle—objective is formulated, plan or rule of action is developed, order is given, response is made to the order, work is achieved, results are evaluated —a cycle of stimulus and response, of human behavior. As a process, it may be legal, it may be political or governmental, it may be scientific and factual, it may be social; but all the while it is carried along by individuals and is psychological.

2. *Problems Ahead*

In an endeavor to find out what kinds of things one should study in order to gain proficiency in this field of work, two opposite assumptions about administration were examined. The first of these is that the nature of administration derives from the nature of the service it performs, limited only, and influenced, as well, by the capacities of the performers. Opposed to this idea is the assumption that administration is something in itself, something that is self-determining and, so, quite independent of the service it performs. Of these two concepts, the first was chosen to guide this inquiry. Since, by choice of approach here, one largely determines the system of values by which all further reasoning must proceed, this is an important matter. Certainly one next step would call for a much more thorough examination of these two concepts, not only as matters of philosophy, of theory of management, but especially for their implications for practice. What, for instance, would administrative authority be like and how would it give force to a decision or an order by each of these concepts?

Examination of these concepts seems to reveal the basis for many of the present-day criticisms of administration. By the former, a decision or an order stems from science, from knowledge of the task; by the latter, from the authority of the administrator—the will that gives effect to the decision. In the one case, the order has first to be discovered and, as it were, extracted from the facts and the circumstances it is designed to care for; in the other, it is but the

will of the administrator and the logic consequent to his order.

It is doubtful whether any administrator would admit complete allegiance to the latter concept; yet, despite this fact, men seem often to fall into the use of this view of it. Why is this? It is said that, by nature, man wants and strives to live in security. If each command must square with facts and circumstances, it is open to question and the one who gives it must be in constant fear of criticism. When one's own decisions and orders are, in fact, the law and the power; when they cannot be questioned, then security is in no way disturbed when they are issued. There must be times in the lives of all administrators when there is temptation to seek relief from the stresses of action by resort to the acceptance and use of this authoritarian view.

Much has been said and written, of late, about democracy in administration. A thorough study of these two assumptions as to what administration is might help to replace some of the oratory with clear reasoning and with definitions that would lead to enlightment. Much of the discussion about democracy in administration has been emotional and has been a clamor for the rights of teachers. The problem of democracy here originates in and should be concerned with the efficient performance of the school service —teaching and care of children, supervision, administration, care of plant, care of records, and care of matters of public relations, all together. There can be little good in trying to cure the special ills of a system as separate ills. What is needed is an attack upon their causes. Until we have a sound theory of administration to work from, there will be disagreement about details, often for quite wrong reasons. If teachers' rights are abused, there probably is reason for studying more than the immediate circumstances of a particular case.

Even yet, we have administrators who resent the idea of a book of rules and regulations for the government of the

schools. They seem to fear to state what conception of government they wish to work by. We have teachers who similarly dread the beginning of a curriculum-revision program. They seem to fear to apply openly the test of scientific study to what they are doing. To talk about democracy in administration should mean to talk about the science and the art of performance for that function. If we want teachers' rights protected, we should, first of all, be sure of the foundation of such rights. What concept of education has the state used in establishing schools? What concept of administration must we accept as the implication of the state's purpose in establishing schools? What are the implications of this concept of administration for the governing policies of the schools and for the methods and techniques to be used in the performance of administrative tasks? Teachers have legal rights. They have rights inherent in the nature and dignity of the work of teaching. These rights are, in part, defined in law; in part, they are defined by our system of professional ethics, together with the social and moral standards that underlie the ethics. When we refer to these "rights of the position," we have to remember that these rights are based upon the high social, political, and moral responsibility of teaching and upon the high scientific qualifications required before one is permitted to teach. One has legal rights if he holds a position. He has these other rights, however, only if he qualifies for the position and bears the responsibilities of it. The state provides the one; the other the teacher must bring with him.

Other discussions of democracy in administration have seemed to stress the necessity for everyone's having a part in every decision made. This, again, drops into the fallacy of confusing means and ends. There is little point in a procedure that is so long-drawn-out as often to defeat its own end. Operating the mill of democracy is important, but so is the grist. More important than the call for "all having a say" is the question of who, in the case, should have a say, in order that action may be democratic and that

the best decision may be reached with the greatest dispatch. In deciding this, one is certain to put his theory of administration to a test. The answer will readily relate itself to one or the other of our two concepts. If it does not, confusion of ideas or incompetency in performance will be reflected.

Examination of all the criticisms of administration we could find, however useful as a means of testing our concepts, would provide only a negative approach to the task of building a theory of administration. We need, also, a positive approach, by which the purposes, mechanism, processes and products of administration would be examined as they exist in the management of schools. There must be a reason for doing things; there must be a reason why a given task can be done better by one group than by another, by one than by many, or by many than by one; there usually are good and poor methods and techniques to choose among. A good procedure or a good product is good in terms of recognizable values, often by clearly definable, ones.

Whichever concept of administration one may choose, let him try to justify his action in terms of net social and net individual benefits. Then and then only will *rights* be safely protected. In doing this, one need not proceed only deductively. Let him also begin with children, books, lessons, instruction; or with finance, land, and buildings, for schools—with the task at hand—and let him try to define and justify his proposed action, step by step. Such inductive study will lead to basic principles of action that reveal the nature of administration.

Another next step for an extension of this study has also to do with the nature of administration. In the above, concern was with the values by which the nature of administration is to be defined. Here, reference is made to the nature of the data of administration. Obviously, these are not wholly separate questions, though they are sufficiently individual to warrant separation for purposes of study. One's theory of administration must largely determine what data

he will choose for study. It is proposed here that we need to know more about these data if we are to be sure, either that we are finding all the data that belong to this science, or that we know all the characteristics of the data.

From the above, it is apparent that the data of administration are derived in part from a study of society and in part from a study of the individual, both living in a physical environment. Education is developed in terms of the needs and capacities of people, and it is the function of administration to provide for and facilitate the processes of education. Education that is in terms of individual and social needs will have to recognize the laws by which individual nature can be influenced by educational activities and recognize, also, the laws by which societies exist and carry on their activities. Education has had to recognize that individuals are not alike and that their needs vary from year to year. Although administration has recognized these facts more and more fully, it still uses machinery that partially ignores them. Education's contacts with society have to do with similarities and differences among groups, communities, and districts; but they have to do with social change, as well. In all its realm, then, education is a very special process. Children are taught in part from books and lectures and in part by participating in the daily regimen of life—work and play—in the school.

These facts of individual and social differences and these facts of individual development and social change are a part of the data of administration. Administration must so organize the schools as to give proper recognition to these facts. A class or a school must be made a society (an American society). Instruction groups must be formed to fit the capacities and needs of individuals and must be adjusted to differences in biological, psychological, and social development, alike. Size of class is not a question of cost or of size of room only or first of all; by this reasoning, it should be the other way around. Many of the features of the administrative mechanism of our schools today were

designed long ago, when a very different notion of the process of learning prevailed. Or, not infrequently, we design a plan of management as a separate administrative machine, when it should originate in the need for a slight modification in the instructional process. Guidance started just this way and was years in finding its error.

In the administration of instruction we design for teaching, we construct courses and curriculums, we provide research. How often we hear talk of social change—just now, even of a new age. Do we keep the social life of the school in a given community, and do we keep the plan of our curriculum continuously under review for the implications of these social changes?

This suggestion is not at all new. It is pointed out here only as one of the implications of our assumption about the nature of administration. If we really design our administration in terms of "the nature of the job," we must keep our whole scheme of education under continuous study. Our question here is, How can we train men so that they will adhere to this idea? What subject matter do we need for this? Administration cannot be static in this world and be faithful to its possibilities or to its proper obligations as an instrument of social progress.

There is yet a third next step that is suggested by what has been said above. In a sense, it has to do with particularizing what has just been said. In our study of school administration it was common sense to begin by study of the tasks as we found them. Always the pressure was for an answer to some question of what to do or how or when to do it. Once a workable plan was found, it was natural to use it and to pass it on to students. Inevitably, this resulted in our assembling patterns, techniques, and recipes, and neglecting to concern ourselves with why. Now we find administration trying to lift itself by its bootstraps. A thing so self-contained tends to become mechanical, self-satisfied, and sure of itself. Soon it is crystallized and defies change.

If our reasoning is sound, school administration is not thus self-contained; nor is it a mere set of gadgets or prescrip-

tions. It is responsible to education as conceived by the state and provided for by the laws. The state has not commanded the details of management through its laws, but has provided that education shall be carried on only by people who are wise in its ways; to these people it has passed the obligation to apply our social and political philosophy and to apply the facts and methods of science in the task of formulating and directing its schools.

It is to these outside sources, as well as to the practical demands of the service, that administration must turn if it is to go beyond the view that school executives need only to know a well-chosen set of patterns and recipes. So far, these sources have not been adequately tapped for what they can and must contribute to the understanding of school administration. School administration need not be a mere trade. It should be a profession. It can be a profession, however, only if it acknowledges its relationships to government, to law, to economics and business, to sociology and anthropology, and to psychology, and if it draws upon these fields for the subject matter that they are equipped to yield.

In the light of what this study has seemed to the writer to suggest, we need the following:

1. A much more exhaustive study of the nature of the administrative process itself, with a careful examination of all its underlying assumptions.

2. A careful study of the connection between school administration and the government, from which one might assemble the facts and principles that are essential for explaining education as a function of the state. Part of this would deal with our political theory and part with the facts and principles of our sciences of public administration and public finance. School administrators should have an understanding of the nature of the political process.[1]

3. A study of law that goes beyond that part of law which

[1] See Landon G. Rockwell, "Toward a More Integrated Political Science Curriculum." *The American Political Science Review,* 41:314–320, April, 1947.

we use directly in school administration. The philosophy of law and the developments in administrative law, both have important contributions to make to the basic principles of school administration.

4. We have gone far in our use of knowledge from the fields of engineering and business. The school-survey movement and our numerous books on school business management reflect this. Even here, however, we could extend our studies, with emphasis upon the way by which we apply educational values in reaching conclusions on business decisions in school work. This would be concerned with who is to decide, as well as with how and what to decide; that is, with the placement and flow of educational authority (as well as of knowledge) in the settlement of business questions.

5. No newly cultivated area of the field of education has contributed more importantly to education science and practice than has educational sociology. Administration has been influenced by its interpretations less, perhaps, than has curriculum work or guidance or classroom work or the social programs; but not a little, as to its general outlook and methods of control. Educational sociology has brought to education a rather broad outlook upon civilization as a whole, and its teachings have been well digested by our practice.

Administration, being responsible for shaping and directing education, should be strongly tinged with this broad social point of view. If one were to take what is commonly accepted as the subject matter of cultural anthropology and from that extract the information and principles that can be used in administration, he might have the ideal social understanding of this function. Educational sociology has reached almost beyond its own scientific borders in this direction and, in doing this, has in a way pointed to our need for a subject called educational anthropology. If a study of the administrative process and mechanism were made from the standpoint of their nature as an item or a

unit in our culture, and were carried on by the application of the concepts of culture development and operation to the tasks of directing, planning, control, organization, and coordination, it could hardly fail to enrich our understanding of the school as a human enterprise.[2]

6. Through educational psychology, the facts and principles of that science have been exhaustively studied for their bearing upon the meaning and processes of education. Their direct application to problems of the care and instruction of children have been made on an extensive scale. They have been interpreted for use in class management, in health work, in curriculum making, and in supervision. Administration has not been entirely left out, but so far we are decidedly short on the psychological approach to the study of school administration, if we judge by the available literature that takes direct hold of this approach. We have volumes on the psychology of learning and of teaching, but no corresponding volumes on the psychology of management. Yet, there are few administrative problems that are not, at some stage or in some phase, psychological. Consider the nature and use of authority in administration, or the use of science in settling questions of control, or the place of professional ethics in management. It is believed that a thorough and extensive study could bring forth a volume that would be of great value in this area.

Our complaint is not that all these sources have not been used at all. They certainly have been used. But when one goes through the literature on school administration in search of the kinds of studies suggested above, he finds far too little recognition of any straightforward attack upon the problems here suggested.

One thing needed is a study of the beginning courses in education and of the many excellent textbooks now avail-

[2] See Alexander H. Leighton, *The Governing of Men.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1945. This illustrates one point of contact that administration can have with anthropology.

able for use in those courses. Certainly such a course should lay a foundation for the function of administration, as it does for other parts of the field of education. But what is our picture of that foundation? What are the actual items that we wish to present in this course, wherein breadth rather than depth of exposure is the purpose? Can teachers of administration list and characterize the problems they would like to have explained in this course? It is in this course we should discover that administration is not separate from but is intimately related to all the other functions, and that the psychology and sociology that explain learning and teaching are used also to explain administration.

We might do well to examine what general education is actually doing (in high school, junior college, and upper division) to provide a foundation in the basic sciences for school administration. We should not want it to substitute "preparatory" for its present "general-education" objectives, but rather, to consider just how general education (in the social sciences basic to educational administration) can be used in the construction of a foundation for professional training in administration. How might it function also in a sound preparatory training program?

The question of training through internship and by apprenticeship experience has been considered. Certainly these ideas have not been disposed of. We recognize the difficulty of teaching the art aspects of administration without the use of practice and drill. We find it difficult to develop skill for responsible service by practice acquired in a make-believe situation, in which one can feel neither the power of decision nor the burden of responsibility. To make the work responsible, on the one hand, and to give it value to the intern or the apprentice, on the other, presents a difficult problem for solution. Experience, so far, does not suggest that these possibilities should be discarded, however.

It goes without saying that school administration is chang-

ing. The field is growing. That already there is in sight the beginnings of a general science of administration does not seem less true after a look at the studies appearing in school administration than after a look at those from other administrative realms.[3] Students of school administration may well give more thought to these beginnings. This might suggest a study of the use a school administration program might make of corresponding courses in business, engineering, political science, and law.

School administration has made use of the problem method of teaching and, in that connection, has to some extent brought the case-study idea into use. So far, this has not led to the development of a good collection of case studies. It is not the writer's idea that we need case studies merely to make our textbook work a bit more realistic, even though they could make a contribution, there. The use of case studies in building our science is even more important. The difficult point in administration (difficult to pin down for study) is the point at which science and art come together in performance. How are decisions made in administration? Rarely by one person; generally, by several, who, by their social skills, manage to get on together, despite differences in viewpoint. We must have other cases in which the problem is primarily one of science, and others still in which it is primarily one of art. Case study would require us to know more specifically what elements are involved.

Case studies might be slow in mining out ultimate principles[4] but experience in such study could hardly fail to make us more discriminating as to what elements are in-

[3] See Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. Also Edwin O. Stone, "An Approach to a Science of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1124–1137, December, 1940.

[4] See William E. Mosher, "Case Studies in Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 33:66–68, February, 1939.

volved and what the nature of these elements is in any administrative act.[4a]

Because of the writer's desire to get at the foundations for the subject matter of school administration as a whole, there is one aspect of the problem that has not received adequate treatment in this study. It is the field of administration itself. Although this is the field we have worked in most of all, perhaps, yet, it is so complex and so changing that nothing short of an extensive special study can suffice to reveal the substance of its subject matter. Aside from the points made on this area in Chap. 5, there are a number of related problems that need careful study. We have not yet made a satisfactory analysis of the work of administration; we have done somewhat better (for some areas) in our studies of what administrators actually do. There are two approaches to (or aspects of) the study of the subject matter of school administration which, if they were investigated and checked against each other, could be very fruitful. There is the field of professional activities of administrators, a field touched very lightly indeed,[5] even though everyone would consider it important.[6] Then, there is the question of the tools of administration. To what extent, in what ways, does the actual work of administration call for a knowledge of research methods or of such special instruments as statistics or graphic representation or interview techniques? Our texts have not stressed wide reading and familiarity with the literature of the field; nor have they offered help on how to find one's way in our great

[4a] See the author's "A Program of Instruction for School Administrators." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 35:129–149, March, 1949.

[5] A modest attempt to remedy this may be found in the author's text, *Public School Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947.

[6] Our neglect of this phase of professional education appears to be paralleled in law schools by their neglect to teach much of anything in legal procedure, especially in the field of administrative law.

library collections. They have not stressed training in the use of the source materials of this field.

These points suggest some of the phases of the problem here dealt with which must have more study than they have so far received before we can set down the subject matter through which a student could learn the administrative process as it actually is and as it should be going on in our schools.

It should not be necessary to remind the reader that this study of subject matter has been concerned with finding what it could about the nature of the subject matter of a science and a profession. It has not been concerned with breaking that subject matter down for instructional use, with molding it into work units or into courses, or of forming the courses into a curriculum. These are still other problems, related alike to subject matter and to the methodology of teaching it.

Finally, to repeat, we have made remarkable headway in building a subject matter for the study of public school administration. This is clearly apparent from our textbooks in the field, from the announcements of courses on the subject that are offered in our colleges and universities, from the flow of researches and documents, and from the practice in our schools. To have done well in the first half century of study is not enough, however. There is much yet to be done. It is hoped that this little volume may have helped in some specific ways to bring into view portions of this field that have hitherto remained untilled.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The literature of this field must inevitably be very wide in its range. Accordingly, the titles for the following bibliographies have been chosen less with a view to completeness than to showing the many and varied sources from which administration derives its nature and its continuous nourishment. Most fully represented are the fields of administrative law, public administration, and business administration; with some contacts with engineering, anthropological studies, and the more direct study of school administration. When the contributions—now so much needed—from psychology, ethics, political theory, sociology, and educational philosophy have been made more direct, as soon they must be if public-administration, administrative-law, and industrial-management problems continue to perplex; and if the present interest in personnel problems, in social and personality psychology, and in cultural anthropology continues; then we shall have foundation material for the beginnings of a science of administration—a science that concerns itself not with work and materials alone or with management alone or with society alone or with man alone, but with the nature of all of these in combination.

One cannot pursue the problems of administration much below the surface without facing all these fields of knowledge. More, too, than a casual contact with their substance is required to explain the nature of administration, for the solution of the practical problems of administrative law carry back at once to the philosophy of law; of business, to economic theory; and of public administration, to questions of legislation, the theory of government and of the state itself. In similar fashion, the practical bearing of our complex cultural forces—tradition, custom, convention, speech, manners, morals, professional ethics, public opinion—rooted as they are not only in the social past, but in the biology

and psychology of man himself, call for more direct consideration, as actual part and parcel of our administrative mechanism and process, than they have yet received.

Trying to build an administrative superstructure without reference to the upreaching powers of these basic forces is to ensure inconsistency, conflicts, and frustration in practice. Too much of present administrative practice is superficial in these respects. The blame for this lies less with those in office, perhaps, than with those who trained them. It lies mainly with the state of our knowledge; in part, no doubt, with society in general and the times; and with the imperfections and limitations of human nature. Yet, a word can be said for those who teach administration. First, administration as a subject is very young. The bibliographies here listed show clearly that the rapid growth of administrative practice alone is enough to account for delay in coming to scientific grips with the field and for many of the consequent problems. Administrative law is under terrific pressure, and in recent years it is getting down to basic matters. The Acheson study and now the Hoover Report—to mention two major attacks upon public administration—reveal how this field, too, is beginning to show promising methods of study. The urgency of need in this field is indicated by the current work assigned to the Hoover Committee by the president. Engineering, in its special fields, and work going on in our schools of business are making rapid headway. Besides, school administration has something to show for its work of the past half century. But, in spite of all this, the goal is yet far ahead of us.

A second major difficulty is to be found in our approach and method of study. So far, we seem to have studied law mainly as law, politics as politics, economics as economics, business as business, anthropology as anthropology, and ethics as ethics. Of late, we have studied school administration as school administration. There has been a strong tendency—a tradition, in fact—for the scholars of each of these fields to take offense at the intrusion of their own fields

by free lancers or representatives of other fields. Running counter to this tradition, however, is the growing evidence that there can be no sound scholarship in such fields as administration without crossing many of these old borders. The student of administration must go to the literature of psychology, sociology, politics, law, engineering, anthropology, ethics, business, and economics; and there he must mine out for himself such facts and principles as these sciences alone can offer, to supply an important part of the basic data for a science of administration. More than this, he must go to the men of these fields themselves with the problems of administration and must help them to see how they can contribute to the development of a science of administration.

The collection of titles prepared for this book has been arranged in two groups, one concerned directly with the problems treated in Parts I and II; the other, with those of Part III. This division has been made for the convenience of the reader, who at any one time may be specially concerned with one or the other of two purposes—(1) to learn about the nature of the administrative process; (2) particularly for a teacher of the subject, to learn what has been developed by way of a subject matter for the field. Although the object of Part III of the book was primarily to throw light upon the nature of the administrative process, it had also a secondary purpose—to develop a theory for the preparation of subject matter through which the science and philosophy of administration could be learned. Any one interested in the nature of administration, in the development of a science and philosophy of administration, will be equally interested in the two collections. The reader who is specially interested in teaching the subject, however, will find the separate listing of Group II very convenient. One warning to note is that, although only a few titles appear in both Group I and Group II, there is much else in either group that would throw light upon the problems of the other.

These collections of titles are believed to be fully representative of the literature that bears directly upon the problem of this book. That many of the works here listed were written with no thought of their contributing to an explanation of the nature of the administrative process or of the subject matter of this field will be obvious. That these very titles offer much that is most basic to such explanations will be obvious only to those who are willing to study. Of the two lists as a whole, it can be said with fair assurance that in them is included most of the best we know concerning the nature of the administrative process and concerning the subject matter of the field of school administration.

Group I for Parts I and II

Books and Articles Concerned with the Nature of the Administrative Process

Acheson Report, *Administrative Procedure in Government Agencies.* Sen. Doc. No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st Sess., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941. viii + 473 pp.

Aitchison, Clyde B., "Reforming the Administrative Process." *George Washington Law Review,* 7:703–725, April, 1939.

Allen, Carleton Kemp, *Democracy and the Individual.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1943. 109 pp.

Almack, John C., *The School Board Member.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. 281 pp.

American Association of School Administrators, *School Boards in Action.* Washington, D.C.: The Association, Twenty-fourth Yearbook, 1946. 412 pp.

Ames, James Barr, "Law and Morals." *Harvard Law Review,* 22:97–113, December, 1908.

Anderson, William, and John M. Gaus, *Research in Public Administration.* Social Science Research Council, Committee on Public Administration, Studies in Administration, Vol. XIII, 1945.

Arkin, H., *Ethics as Legislation.* Cambridge, Mass.: Science-Art Publishers, 1945. 256 pp.

Baker, John C., *Directors and Their Functions.* Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1945. xiii + 145 pp.

Barnard, Chester I., *Dilemmas of Leadership in the Democratic Process (Stafford Little Lectures).* Princeton, N.J.: University Extension Fund, Herbert L. Baker Foundation, Princeton University, 1939. 27 pp.

———, *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938. xvi + 334 pp.

Bates, George E., "The Board of Directors." *Harvard Business Review,* 19:72–87, Autumn, 1940.

Bateson, William, *Principles of Organization, also Collecting and Recording Statistics and Office Equipment.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1923. vii + 84 pp.

Beard, Charles Austin, *Philosophy, Science and Art of Public Administration.* Address, Annual Conference of Governmental Research Association, Princeton, N.J., 1939. 7 pp.

Benson, George C. S., "Internal Administrative Organization." *Public Administration Review,* 1:473–486, Autumn, 1941.

Bentham, Jeremy, *Theory of Legislation.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1864. xv + 472 pp.

———, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill, *Selected Writings.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1935.

Bikle, Henry Wolf, "Administrative Discretion." *George Washington Law Review,* 2:1–12, November, 1933.

Blachly, Frederick F., and M. E. Oatman, "A New Approach to the Reform of Regulatory Procedure." *Georgetown Law Journal,* 72:325–374, May, 1944.

———, *Administrative Legislation and Adjudication.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1934. xv + 296 pp.

———, *Federal Regulatory Action and Control.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1940. xviii + 356 pp.

Burleigh, B. Gardner, *Human Relations in Industry.* Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1945. xi + 307 pp.

Caldwell, Louis G., "Comments on the Procedure of the Federal Administrative Tribunals, with Particular Reference to the Federal Communications Commission." *George Washington Law Review,* 7:740–776, April, 1939.

Cantwell, Frank V., "Public Opinion and Legislative Process." *The American Political Science Review,* 40:924–935, October, 1946.

Cardozo, Benjamin N., *The Nature of the Judicial Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921. 180 pp.

———, *The Growth of the Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924. 145 pp.

Carpenter, W. W., A. G. Capp, and L. G. Townsend, *Suggestions for a Code of Rules and Regulations for Missouri Boards of Education.* Columbia: University of Missouri, 1940. 57 pp.

———, "Democratic Procedures in Developing a Code of Rules and Regulations." *The American School Board Journal,* 102:25–26, April, 1941.

Carson, John J., "The Role of Communication in the Process of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 4:7–15, Winter, 1944.

Christie, Charles, "A Note on Administrative Principle." *Public Administration,* 10:87–99, January, 1932.

———, "Democracy and the Expert." *Public Administration,* 11:351–368, October, 1933.

Chroust, Anton H., "Law and the Administrative Process: An Epistemological Approach to Jurisprudence." *Harvard Law Review,* 58:573–588, April, 1945.

Clapp, Gordon D., "Toward a Science of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 1:82–84, Autumn, 1940.

Cohen, Felix S., *Ethical Systems and Legal Ideals.* New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., 1933. xi + 303 pp.

Comer, John Preston, *Legislative Functions of National Ad-*

ministrative Authorities. New York: Columbia University, Ph.D. thesis, 1927.

Cooper, Robert M., "Administrative Justice and the Role of Discretion." *The Yale Law Journal,* 47:577–602, February, 1938.

Copeland, Melvin T., and Andrew R. Towl, *The Board of Directors and Business Management.* Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1947. xii + 202 pp.

Coudert, Frederick R., *Certainty and Justice.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1914. 320 pp.

Cushman, Robert E., *The Independent Regulatory Commission.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. xiv + 780 pp.

Davis, Kenneth Culp, "The Requirement of Opportunity to Be Heard in the Administrative Process." *The Yale Law Journal,* 51:1093–1142, May, 1942.

———, "An Approach to Problems of Evidence in the Administrative Process." *Harvard Law Review,* 55:364–425, January, 1942.

Davison, J. Forrester, "Administrative and Judicial Self-limitation." *George Washington Law Review,* 4:291–324, March, 1936.

———, "Administrative Legislation." *Illinois Law Review,* 34:651–679, 1940.

Deffenbaugh, W. S., *Practices and Concepts Relating to City Boards of Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1941. iii + 27 pp. Also appears as Chap. VII, Vol. I of *Biennial Survey of Education in the United States,* 1938–1940.

Dewey, John, *The Public and Its Problems.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1927. vi + 224 pp.

Dickinson, John, "Judicial Control of Official Discretion." *The American Political Science Review,* 22:275–300, May, 1928.

———, "The Acheson Report: A Novel Approach to Administrative Law." *University of Pennsylvania Law Re-*

view and American Law Register, 90:757–779, May, 1942.

Dillon, John F., *Commentaries on the Law of Municipal Corporations.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1911. 5th ed., 5 vols.

Dimock, Marshall Edward, *The Executive in Action.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945. ix + 276 pp.

———, "Some Aspects of American Administrative Law." *Public Administration,* 9:417–422, October, 1931.

———, "Potential Incentives of Public Employment." *The American Political Science Review,* 27:628–636, August, 1936.

Douglas, William O., "Directors Who Do Not Direct." *Harvard Law Review,* 47:1305–1334, June, 1934.

Dykstra, Clarence A., "The Quest for Responsibility." *The American Political Science Review,* 33:1–25, February, 1939.

Edwards, Newton, "School Law—II. Court Decisions." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. 1022–1027.

Fairlie, John A., "Public Administration and Administrative Law." In *Essays on the Law and Practice of Governmental Administration.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 3–43. xvii + 321 pp.

Fayol, Henri, "The Administrative Theory in the State." Chap. IV in *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. 195 pp. (includes 11 separate papers).

Feller, A. H., "Administrative Procedure and the Public Interest—The Result of Due Process." *Washington University Law Quarterly,* 25:308–320, April, 1940.

Finer, Herman, "Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government." *Public Administration Review,* 1:335–350, Summer, 1941.

Follett, Mary Parker, "The Process of Control." Chap. VIII, in *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther

H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937.

Fosdick, Dorothy, "Ethical Standards and Political Strategies." *Political Science Quarterly,* 57:214–228, June, 1942.

Frank, Jerome, *If Men Were Angels—Some Aspects of Government in a Democracy.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942. xii + 380 pp.

———, *Fate and Freedom.* New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1945. viii + 375 pp.

———, *Law and the Modern Mind.* New York: Brentano's Inc., 1931. xix + 368 pp.

Frankfurter, Felix, "Expert Administration and Democracy." Chap. IV in *The Public and Its Government.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930. 170 pp.

Freund, Ernst, "Substitution of Rule for Discretion in Public Law." *The American Political Science Review,* 9:666–676, 1915.

———, *Administrative Powers over Persons and Property.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. xxi + 620 pp.

———, *et. al.,* In *The Growth of American Administrative Law.* St. Louis: Thomas Law Book Company, 1923. 190 pp.

Friedrich, Carl J., and Taylor Cole, *Responsible Bureaucracy.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932. xvi + 93 pp.

Friedrich, Carl J., and Edward S. Mason (Eds.), *Public Policy.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940. xiii + 391 pp. See Chap. I.

Fuchs, Ralph S., "Procedure in Administrative Rule Making." *Harvard Law Review,* 52:259–280, December, 1938.

———, "Concepts and Policies in Anglo-American Administrative Law Theory." *Yale Law Journal,* 47:538–576, February, 1938.

Fuller, Edgar, "Liability for Negligence of Educational Offi-

cers and Employees." *The American School Board Journal,* 103:29–30, October, 1941; and pp. 23–25, November, 1941.

Gantt, Henry L., *Organizing for Work.* New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., 1919. v + 113 pp.

Garlan, Edwin Norman, *Legal Realism and Justice.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. xii + 161 pp.

Garland, C. H., "Some Reflections on Administration." *Public Administration,* 7:43–50, January, 1929.

Gaus, John M., Leonard D. White, and Marshall L. Dimock, "The Role of Discretion in Modern Administration." Chap. IV in *The Frontiers of Public Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. ix + 146 pp.

Gellhorn, Walter, *Federal Administrative Proceedings.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. 150 pp.

Gibbon, I. G., "Framework of Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 5:235–243, July, 1927.

———, "The Official and His Authority." *Public Administration,* 4:81–94, April, 1926.

Glaser, Comstock, "Managing Committee Work in a Large Organization." *Public Administration Review,* 1:249–256, Spring, 1941.

———, *Administrative Procedure.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941. 207 pp.

Gordon, J., "Operating Statistics as a Tool of Management." *Public Administration Review,* 4:189–196, Summer, 1944.

Green, Leon, "The Administrative Process." *American Bar Association Journal,* 21:708–712 and 738, November, 1935.

Griswold, Erwin N., "Government in Ignorance of the Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 48:198–213, December, 1934.

Gulick, Luther H., "Research in Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 9:388–392, October, 1931.

———, "Notes on the Theory of Organization." Chap. I in *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York:

Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. 195 pp.

———, "Science Values in Public Administration." Chap. XI in *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. 195 pp.

Gulick, Luther H., and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. v + 195 pp.

Hadley, Arthur Twining, *The Relation between Freedom and Responsibility in the Evolution of Democratic Government.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921. 175 pp.

Haines, Charles G., "The Adaptation of Administrative Law and Procedure to Constitutional Theories and Principles." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1–30, February, 1940.

———, "Effects of the Growth of Administrative Law upon Traditional Anglo-American Legal Theories and Practices." *The American Political Science Review,* 26:-875–894, October, 1932.

———, and Marshall E. Dimock, *Essays on the Law and Practice of Governmental Administration in Memory of Frank J. Goodnow.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. xvii + 321 pp.

Hale, George E., "Administrative Hearings under the Federal Constitution." *Kentucky Law Journal,* 30:137–173, January, 1942.

Hall, Arnold Bennett, *Popular Government.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. 296 pp.

Hamilton, Robert R., and Paul R. Mort, *The Law and Public Education—with Cases.* Chicago: The Foundation Press, Inc., 1941. xxv + 579 pp.

Hart, James, "Some Aspects of Delegated Rule Making." *Virginia Law Review,* 25:810–823, May, 1939.

———, "Administrative Justice and the Supremacy of Law." *Georgetown Law Journal,* 29:543–554, February, 1941.

Havinghurst, Harold C., "Consideration, Ethics and Administration." *Columbia Law Review,* 42:1–31, January, 1942.

Henry, Nelson B., and Jerome G. Kerwin, *Schools and City Government.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. xi + 104 pp.

Herring, Edward P., *Public Administration and the Public Interest.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1936. xii + 416 pp.

Herring, Pendleton, "Executive-Legislative Responsibilities." *The American Political Science Review,* 38:1153–1165, December, 1944.

Hilary, H. O., "The Position and Functions of Committees in Local Administration." *Public Administration,* 7: 376–386, October, 1929.

Holden, P. E., L. S. Fish, and H. L. Smith, *Top-management: Organization and Control.* Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1941.

Hopf, Harry Arthur, "Administrative Coordination." Part III in *Public Management in the New Democracy,* Fritz Morstein Marx. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940. ix + 266 pp.

Humphrey, J. P., "The Theory of the Separation of Functions." *University of Toronto Law Journal,* 6:331–360, Lent Term, 1946.

Hyneman, Charles S., "Bureaucracy and the Democratic System." *Louisiana Law Review,* 6:309–349, December, 1946.

Isaacs, Nathan, "The Limits of Judicial Discretion." *Yale Law Journal,* 32:339–352, February, 1923.

Jackson, J. Hugh, *The Comptroller: His Functions and Organization.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948. ix + 97 pp.

Jones, Victor, *Metropolitan Government.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. xxiv + 364 pp.

Juran, J. M., *Bureaucracy: A Challenge to Better Administration.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944. xii + 138 pp.

Konop, Thomas F., "The Advent of the Administrative Process and Its Future." *Notre Dame Lawyer,* 16:155–182, March, 1941.

Landis, James M., "Crucial Issues in Administrative Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 53:1077–1102, May, 1940.

———, *The Administrative Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. 160 pp.

Laski, Harold J., "Growth of Administrative Discretion." *Public Administration,* 1:92–100, 1923.

Latham, E., "Executive Management and the Federal Field Service." *Public Administration Review,* 5:16–27, Winter, 1945.

———, "The Technique of Administrative Reporting," *Public Administration Review,* 3:106–118, Spring, 1943.

Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix, "Remarks on Administrative and Critical Communications Research." *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science,* 9:2–16, 1941. New York: Institute of Social Research, 1941.

Lee, John, "The Parallels between Industrial Administration and Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 4:216–222, July, 1926.

———, "The Pros and Cons of Functionalization." Chap. IX in *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. 195 pp.

Leighton, Alexander H., *The Governing of Men.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1945. xvi + 404 pp.

Levitan, David, "Political Ends and Administrative Means." *Public Administration Review,* 3:353–359, Autumn, 1943.

Leys, Wayne A. R., "Ethics and Administrative Discretion." *Public Administration Review,* 3:10–23, Winter, 1943.

Linton, Ralph, *The Cultural Background of Personality.*

New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1945. xix + 157 pp.

Lowell, A. Lawrence, *Public Opinion and Popular Government.* New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., Inc., 1913. xiv + 415 pp.

———, *Conflicts of Principle.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932. 161 pp.

McCamy, James L., "Analysis of the Process of Decision—Making." *Public Administration Review,* 7:41–48, Winter, 1947.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince.* Harvard Classics, New York: P. F. Collier and Son, 1910. Vol. 36, pp. 1–90.

Macqueen, Percy, "The Elements of Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 13:279–289, July, 1935.

McGuire, O. R., "Control of Administrative Responsibility —A Little Practical Virtue Is to Be Preferred to Theory." *George Washington Law Review,* 7:304–324, January, 1939.

McIntire, John A., "Government Corporations As Administrative Agencies: An Approach." *The George Washington Law Review,* 4:161–210, January, 1936.

Magaw, Elden S., "Legal Aspects of Administrative Hearings and Findings." *Mississippi Law Journal,* 12:295–332, March, 1940.

Malinowski, Bronislaw, *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944. ix + 228 pp.

Merriam, Charles E., "The Assumptions of Democracy." *Political Science Quarterly,* 53:328–349, September, 1938.

Merson, F., "Public Administraton: A Science." *Public Administration,* 1:220–227, 1923.

Metcalf, Henry C., and L. Urwick, *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942. 320 pp.

Mill, James, "Government." In *Jeremy Bentham, James Mill*

and John Stuart Mill—Selected Writings. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1935. xxvi + 477 pp.

Mill, John Stuart, *On Liberty.* Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1921. 161 pp.

Moehlman, Arthur B., *School Administration—Its Development, Principles, and Future in the United States.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1940. xvii + 929 pp.

Montesquieu, de, Charles de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et, *The Spirit of Laws.* London: Printed for J. Mourse and P. Vallant, 1752. 2 vols.

Mooney, James D., "The Principles of Organization." Chap. III in *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther H. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.). New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. 195 pp.

Morstein Marx, Fritz (Ed.), *Elements of Public Administration.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946. 647 pp.

———, *Public Management in the New Democracy.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940. ix + 266 pp.

———, "The Lawyer's Role in Public Administration." *The Yale Law Journal,* 55:498–526, April, 1946.

Mort, Paul, *Principles of School Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946. xiv + 388 pp.

Mulford, Herbert B., "School Policies as an Aid to Public Relations." *The American School Board Journal,* 103: 15–16, 70, August, 1941.

Munro, William B., "Our Vanishing Government of Laws." *California Law Review,* 31:49–58, December, 1942.

Musgrave, Richard A., "The Planning Approach in Public Economy: A Reply." *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 55:319–324, February, 1941.

National Education Association, Research Division, "The School Board Member." *Research Bulletin,* 24:47–83, April, 1946.

National Education Association, *First Yearbook—The Status*

of the Superintendent. Washington, D.C.: Department of Superintendence, 1923. 206 pp.

———, *Twelfth Yearbook—Critical Problems in School Administration.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Superintendence, 1934. 383 pp.

Neal, Alfred C. "The Planning Approach in Public Economy." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 54:246–254, February, 1940.

Olsen, Hans C., *The Work of Boards of Education. Contributions to Education, No.* 213. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926. 170 pp.

Pearson, Norman M., "Fayolism as the Necessary Complement of Taylorism." *The American Political Science Review,* 39:68–80, February, 1945.

Peikelis, Alexander, "Administrative Discretion and the Rule of Law." *Social Research,* 10:22–37, February, 1943.

Perry, Charner M., "The Relation between Ethics and Political Science." *International Journal of Ethics,* 47:169–170; 172–174, January, 1937.

Person, H. S. (Ed.), *Scientific Management in American Industry. Bulletin* of the Taylor Society, VII, April, 1922.

———, "Research and Planning as Functions of Administration and Management." *Public Administration Review,* 1:65–73, Autumn, 1940.

Pfiffner, John M., *Research Methods in Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940. xv + 477 pp.

———, "Development of Administrative Regulations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 221:1–8, May, 1942.

———, *Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946. Rev. ed. 621 pp.

Pound, Roscoe, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922. 307 pp.

———, *Law and Morals: The McNair Lectures, 1923.* Chapel

Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1926. 2d ed. ix + 144 pp.

———, "The Future of Law." *The Yale Law Journal,* 47:1–13, November, 1937.

———, *Contemporary Juristic Theory.* Claremont, Calif.: Pomona College, Scripps College, 1940. viii + 83 pp.

———, *Administrative Law: Its Growth, Procedures and Significance.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1942. x + 138 pp.

———, "The American Idea of Government." *American Bar Association Journal,* 30:497–503, September, 1944.

———, *Social Control through Law.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. 138 pp.

Powell, Thomas Reed, "Separation of Powers." *Political Science Quarterly,* 27:215–238, June, 1912; 28:34–48, March, 1913.

Raglan, Fitz Roy Richard Somerset, Lord, *How Came Civilization.* London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1939. xi + 191 pp.

Reeder, Ward G., *School Boards and Superintendents.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. 278 pp.

Rice, Stuart A., "The Role and Management of the Federal Statistical System." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:481–488, June, 1940.

Richberg, Donald R., "Developing Ethics and Resistant Law." *Yale Law Journal,* 32:109–122, December, 1922.

Roberts, J. R. Howard, "The Professional Expert and Administrative Control." *Public Administration,* 7:247–251, July, 1929.

Roethlisberger F. J., and William J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. xxiv + 615 pp.

Rosenberry, Marvin B., "The Supremacy of Law: Law vs. Discretion." *Marquette Law Review,* 23:1–12, December, 1938.

———, "Law Versus Discretion in Government." *Tennessee Law Review,* 15:514–531, February, 1939.

Sabine, George H., "What Is the Matter with Representative Government?" *The North American Review,* 213: 587–597, May, 1921.

Schulman, Sidney, "Administrative Procedure—A Survey of Suggested Reforms." *Temple University Law Quarterly,* 15:1–26, November, 1940.

Sears, Jesse B., *Organization of Sacramento's School System.* Sacramento: Board of Education, 1940. 116 pp.

———, "Educational Planning and the Present Emergency." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 28:161–178, March, 1942.

———, *Public School Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947. xviii + 433 pp.

———, "Administrative Discretion vs. (or with) Rules and Regulations." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 29:257–283, May, 1943.

———, "Analysis of School Administrative Controls." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 20:401–430, September, 1934.

———, "Rules and Regulations for the Government of City-school Systems." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 21:175–206, March, 1935.

———, *City School Administrative Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938. xvi + 281 pp.

———, "School Board Control—The Necessary Tools and Procedures." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 28:561–580, November, 1942.

———, "The District Meeting in School Government." *The American School Board Journal,* 111:19–21, July; 27–28, September, 1945.

———, "Rules and Regulations—Their Nature and Place in a System of School Administration." *The American School Board Journal,* 106:21–22, March, 1943; 22–24, April, 1943; 35–36, May, 1943.

———, "School Board Procedures, with Special Reference to

the Use of Hearings." *The American School Board Journal,* 107:44–45, November, 1943; 32–34, and 108, December, 1943; 27–28, February, 1944; 28–29, April, 1944; 43, June, 1944.

———, "Our Theory of Public School Support." *School and Society,* 43:73–84, Jan. 18, 1936.

———, "The Nature of the Administrative Process in Education—A Partial Analysis of the Factors Involved." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 31:1–21, January, 1945.

Sheldon, Oliver, *The Philosophy of Management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1923. xvi + 296 pp.

Sigler, Lewis Allen, "The Problem of Apparently Unguided Administrative Discretion." *St. Louis Law Review,* 19:261–321, June, 1934.

Simon, Herbert A., "The Proverbs of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 6:53–67, Winter, 1946.

———, "Decision-making and Administrative Organization." *Public Administration Review,* 4:16–30, Winter, 1944.

———, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Processes in Administrative Organization.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. xvi + 259 pp. See a review of this by Fritz Morstein Marx in *Public Administration Review,* 8:60–65, Winter, 1948.

———, "The Planning Approach in Public Economy: Further Comment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 55:325–330, February, 1941.

——— and William Divine, "Controlling Human Factors in an Administrative Experiment." *Public Administration Review,* 1:487–492, Autumn, 1941.

Simon, Yves R., *Nature and Functions of Authority.* Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1940. 78 pp.

Smith, H. D., and C. Aikin, "Toward Administrative Evaluation; Review of Management of Your Government." *Public Administration Review,* 6:261–266, Summer, 1946.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., "A Step Forward in Administrative

Law." *New Jersey Law Journal,* 57:205, 207, 209, June 15, 1944.

Springer, A. I., "Administrative Process, the Growth of." *Women Lawyers Journal,* 30:11–12, 32–34, Summer, 1944.

Stafford, Paul T., "The New Amateur in Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 29:257–269, April, 1935.

Stene, Edwin O., "An Approach to a Science of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 34:1124–1137, December, 1940.

Stoke, Harold W., "Executive Leadership and the Growth of Propaganda." *The American Political Science Review,* 35:490–500, June, 1941.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow, *The Principles of Scientific Management.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911. 144 pp.

———, *Shop Management.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911. First published in 1903. 207 pp.

Taylor, Hannis, "The Science of Jurisprudence." *Harvard Law Review,* 22:241–249, February, 1909.

Thompson, C. Bertrand, *The Theory and Practice of Scientific Management.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917. vii + 319 pp.

———, *Scientific Management.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914. xii + 878 pp.

Tocqueville, de, Alexis, *Democracy in America.* Translated by Henry Reeve, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1899. Aldine Ed., 2 vols.

Turner, Jennie McMullin, "Democracy in Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 17:216–230, May, 1923.

Urwick, L., "Executive Decentralization with Functional Coordination." *Public Administration,* 13:344–358, October, 1935.

———, *The Elements of Administration.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1944. 132 pp.

Vogel, Clark Crane, "Some Practical Problems in Administrative Law." *University of Newark Law Review,* 6: 223–250, October, 1941.

Walker, Harvey, "An American Conception of Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 11:15–19, January, 1933.

———, *Federal Limitations upon Municipal Ordinance Making Power.* Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1929. viii + 207 pp.

Walker, Robert A., *The Planning Function in Urban Government.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941. xxi + 376 pp.

Warner, Harry P., "The Administrative Process of the Federal Communications Commission." *Southern California Law Review,* 19:191–243, March, 1946. Continued in July issue, pp. 312–348.

Warner, Roland L., "The Place of Values in Social Theory." *Journal of Social Philosophy and Jurisprudence,* 7:223–239, April, 1942.

Watson, B. W. Walker, "The Elements of Public Administration—A Dogmatic Introduction." *Public Administration,* 10:397–408, October, 1932.

Weeks, O. Douglas, "Initiation of Legislation by Administrative Agencies." *Brooklyn Law Review,* 9:117–131, January, 1940.

Weiss, Paul, "Social, Legal, and Ethical Responsibility." *Ethics,* 57:259–273, July, 1947.

Wells, Roger Hewes, *American Local Government.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1939. xii + 200 pp.

Weltzen, Joachim Frederick, *The Legal Authority of the American Public School as Developed by a Study of Liability to Damages.* Grand Forks, N. D.: The Mid-West Book Concern, 1931. xx + 286 pp.

Wengert, Egbert S., "The Study of Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 36:313–323, April, 1942.

White, Leonard D., *New Horizons in Public Administration.* University of Alabama Press, 1945. 145 pp.

———, *Trends in Public Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933. x + 365 pp. See Chap. IV.

Wigmore, John H., "Administrative Boards and Commissions: Are the Jung Trial Rules of Evidence in Force for Their Inquiries?" *Illinois Law Review,* 17:263–282, December, 1922.

Wilson, Francis G., "The Prelude to Authority." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:12–27, February, 1937.

———, "A Theory of Conservatism." *The American Political Science Review,* 33:29–43, February, 1941.

Wilson, Woodrow, "The Study of Administration." *Political Science Quarterly,* 2:197–222, June, 1887. Also republished in 56:481–506, December, 1941.

Wright, Frank L., "The Proper Functions of Boards of Education." *The American School Board Journal,* 104: 13–15, April, 1942.

Group II for Part III

Books and Articles Concerned with the Nature of the Subject Matter of Public School Administration

A further word of explanation may be helpful in presenting this second group of titles—a list that will be of special interest to the teacher of school administration who must plan courses and curriculums and write textbooks, as well as assist by research in the development of new subject matter and the building of a science of school administration.

First, this list, though widely representative of the best writings on the subject, does not mention textbooks, of which there are many, as explained in Chap. XII. The prefaces and tables of contents of these books are not to be overlooked. Their content shows what we have so far

used as the subject matter for this field, and their prefaces have in many cases indicated the reasons for the choice of materials presented.

To include everything that bears upon the subject would be difficult, for the reason that what is available for the field of administration in any area is likely to have a close bearing upon school administration. Also, the problem itself is extremely broad, for our subject matter must include the philosophy of administration, at one extreme, and the details of practice, including the "tricks of the trade," at the other. By our analysis, it must be concerned with the development of the science of administration, but cannot forget the art; it must be concerned with the actual work to be done, but has to be aware of how the persons involved affect that work and of how the work affects the worker; what we shall teach must be decided, but partly in terms of the capacity of students to learn; the present seems most important, but the past reaches forward and the future beckons and points the way to what we should use as subject matter. So, even when we confine our study to a search for criteria by which to select subject matter, the field still is very wide.

Enough titles from the fields of political science, public administration, the administration of law, and business administration are included to show that in all these fields scholars are struggling with the same problems that we face in school administration. They still do not quite know what goes to make up either the science or the art of administration; and, as is true in school administration, they recognize the important bearing that the teaching method and the use of scientific methods have upon choice of the subject matter that one can use. In the field of public administration, especially, and in administrative law, there appears to have been more direct study of this problem than there has been in the field of school administration.

If studies of the textbooks of the various fields were to be made (see Bibliography: Reining, also, North), we might have a little better idea than we now have of the variation

in viewpoint and in actual matter now used. We know without such studies that there are marked differences in points emphasized, as well as in the materials presented. Some lay more stress upon developing a science of administration; others are more concerned with the growth of a profession (Strayer), that is, in the right application of science to the art of management. For instance, if in looking for subject matter, one would try to accept and be guided by the viewpoint and process of reaching administrative decisions that were used by Leighton (see below) in his study of our Japanese camps, and at the same time to accept the methods commonly used in the older legal approach to administrative decisions (see Hanft), he would scarcely get started; for what one of these approaches would use the other surely could not. Again, if one were to stress what had been called the functional approach, in contrast to a purely descriptive approach to this problem (see Bates, also Spencer), he would view all possible items of subject matter differently.

Consideration of how best to learn and how to teach administration from the standpoint of method can also lead to variation in subject matter. The case method, being seriously experimented with in the public administration field (see McCam, also Mosher), is quite a contrast to the systematic textbook method. It is noticeable that the textbook itself, in a high degree, imposes the general method of teaching; as, when it approaches all problems from the standpoint either of theory, on the one hand, or of its place in the institution or in the administrative mechanism, on the other, in contrast with its approach to each problem merely as a separate problem. The one builds all facts and principles into a system of knowledge; the other develops facility in applying knowledge and management techniques and in the process of investigation and aims to produce an understanding of problems, as problems (see Merrill, also Clapp). Then, there is the apprentice method (see Wingo)

and the in-service education idea (see Lipson). Each of these has in the background, at least, a picture of administration as a subject and as a teaching problem.

Whether it is from a careful study of administration itself (see Woodrow Wilson, also Landis), from a conviction that administration must be made scientific (see Dahl, Noyes, Gulick, Clapp), or more sound in its philosophy (see Chroust, Hanft, Merrill, Warren), or broader in its cultural foundation (see Calkins, Harvard Law School Committee, Field, Hanft, Leighton), or brought up to date with social need and actual change in circumstances of life for our institutions (see Calkins, Dimock, Kirkpatrick, McGuire, Wengert), or a deeper than usual interest in some narrower part or aspect of or approach to administration (see Barnard, Dykstra, Friederich and Trackett, Gulick, McCamy, Pfiffner, Snedden), it is apparent that there is much unrest on this problem and that search for a solution is under way in a wide range of directions.

The line between titles that deal directly with the question as to what is the subject matter of administration, and those that contribute indirectly by discussion of matters pertaining to the science side of it alone, is hard to draw. Some of the problems treated in this part have not attracted direct study elsewhere that the writer has discovered; but on the substance of what belongs in the science there is much direct study and discussion in most of the areas.

The study of anthropology and sociology have been given a place in this book as having a direct contribution to make to administration. For that reason, enough titles have been included from these fields to show that, like education and the other social-science fields, they are having to reshape the stuff they are trying to teach. They, too, have not yet completed the task of building the sciences of their fields, to say nothing of other types of subject matter. Perhaps this task can never be finished for a field so responsible to (and for) social change as is that of school administration. From

the bibliography following, however, no one will infer that the leadership of any of these fields is content to stop working at the task.

American Association of School Administrators, Committee on Certification of Superintendents of Schools, *Standards for Superintendents of Schools. A Preliminary Report.* Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1939. 63 pp.

———, *The Superintendent of Schools and His Work. Final Report of Committee.* Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1940. 48 pp.

Barnard, Chester I., "Comments on the Job of the Executive." *Harvard Business Review,* 18:295–308, Spring, 1940.

———, "Education for Executives." *The Journal of Business* (University of Chicago), 18:145, October, 1945.

Bates, Frank G., "Instruction in Political Science on Functional Rather than Descriptive Lines." *The American Political Science Review,* 21:402–405, May, 1927.

Bliss, Charles A., and Russell B. McNeill, "Management Control in Uniform." *Harvard Business Review,* 12: 226–238, Winter, 1944.

Bridgman, Donald S., "Cultural Elements in Professional Education." *North Central Association Quarterly,* 15: 352–362, April, 1941.

Brown, Esther Lucile, *Lawyers, Law Schools and the Public Service.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1948. 258 pp.

Brownell, Samuel M., Osman R. Hull, and Ward G. Reeder, "Some Needed Adjustments in Courses of School Administration in Light of War Demands." Chap. 6 in *Yearbook* XXIX, *The National Society of College Teachers of Education.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ann Arbor Press, 1944.

Calkins, Robert D., "A Challenge to Business Education." *Harvard Business Review,* 23:174–186, Winter, 1944.

———, "Objectives of Business Education." *Harvard Business Review,* 25:46–57, Autumn, 1946.

Chroust, Anton H., "Law and the Administrative Process; An Epistemological Approach to Jurisprudence." *Harvard Law Review,* 58:573–588, April, 1945.

Clapp, Gordon D., "Toward a Science of Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 1:82–84, Autumn, 1940.

Cocking, Walter D., and Kenneth R. Williams, *The Education of School Administrators. Procedures Used at Selected Institutions.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940. Mimeographed. 146 pp.

Connery, Robert H., "A Laboratory Method for Teaching Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 42:68–74, February, 1948.

Dahl, Robert A., "The Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 7:1–11, Winter, 1947.

Dimock, Marshall E., "Study of Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:28–40, February, 1937.

Dykstra, Clarence A., "The Quest for Responsibility." *The American Political Science Review,* 33:1–25, February, 1939.

Field, Oliver P., "The Study of Administrative Law: A Review and a Proposal." *Iowa Law Review,* 18:233–240, January, 1943.

Fraser, Cecil E. (Ed.), "The Case Method of Instruction." New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1931. ix + 165 pp. In the field of business and industry, and has some bearing on the problem of subject matter as well as method.

Friederich, Carl J., and Mary C. Trackett, "Suggestions for a General Index for Political Science." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:517–525, June, 1937.

Garrison, Lloyd K., "Proposals for Coordinated and Long-Range Experimentation in Curriculum Content and Teaching Techniques." *The American Law School Review,* 9:1318–1333, April, 1942.

Gaus, John M., "The Present Status of the Study of Public Administration in the United States." *The American Political Science Quarterly*, 25:120–134, February, 1931.

——, Leonard D. White, and Marshall E. Dimock, *The Frontiers of Public Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. ix + 146 pp.

Gibbon, I. G., "The Teaching of Public Administration in the United States." *Public Administration,* 1:41–44, 1923.

Gladden, E. N., "On the Study of Public Administration." *Public Administration,* 24:191–195, Autumn, 1946.

Grace, Alonzo G., "The Professional Preparation of School Personnel." *National Society for the Study of Education 45th Year Book,* Pt. II: 176–182, 1946.

Graham, George A., *Education for Public Administration.* Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941. 366 pp.

Gulick, Luther H., and L. Urwick. (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937. v + 195 pp.

Hanft, Frank W., "Legal Education Yields to the Times." *Yale Law Journal,* 47:214–228, December, 1937.

Harvard Law School Committee, "A List of Books for Prospective Law Students Now in Service." *Harvard Law Review,* 58:589–604, April, 1945.

Hill, Clyde M., "Trends in Teaching of School Administration." *School and Society,* 38:33–39, July 8, 1933.

Irish, Marvin D., "Academic Revolution." *American Association of University Professors' Bulletin,* 32:472–484, Autumn, 1946.

Johnson, Palmer O., "Approaches to the Selection and Organization of Subject-matter." Chap. XII in *The Study of College Instruction—Yearbook* XXVII, *The National Society of College Teachers of Education.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ann Arbor Press, 1939.

Keyser, Cassius J., "On the Study of Legal Science." *Yale Law Journal,* 38:413–422, February, 1929.

Kirkpatrick, E. M. (Chairman of Committee), *et al.*, "The Political Science Curriculum in War-time." *The American Political Science Review,* 36:1142–1146, December, 1942.

Landis, James M., "Crucial Issues in Administrative Law." *Harvard Law Review,* 53:1077–1102, May, 1940.

Laswell, Harold D., and A. McDougal Myers, "Legal Education and Public Policy; Professional Training in the Public Interest." *The Yale Law Journal,* 52:203–295, March, 1943.

Lee, R. W., "The Director's Job in Management." *The Management Review,* May, 1940.

Leighton, Alexander H., *The Governing of Men.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946. xvi + 404 pp.

Lipson, Leslie, "Education and Training of Personnel in New Zealand." *Public Administration Review,* 1:257–270, Spring, 1941.

Lund, John, *Education of School Administrators.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education. *Bulletin* 6, 1941. 155 pp.

Managing Editor (Notes and News), "A Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard University; Committee Recommendations." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:315–320, April, 1937.

Marsh, Harold, Jr., "The Law Review and the Law School: Some Reflections about Legal Education." *Illinois Law Review,* 42:424–442, September, 1947.

McCamy, James L., "Analysis of the Process of Decision-making." *Public Administration Review,* 7:41–48, Winter, 1947.

McDonald, Roy W., "The Procedure Curriculum in a Period of Reform." *The American Law School Review,* 9:-1053–1063, May, 1941.

McGuire, O. R., "Reforms Needed in the Teaching of Administrative Law." *George Washington Law Review,* 6:171–180, January, 1938.

Meriam, Lewis, "Value to Students of Courses in Public

Administration." *The American Political Science Review*, 34:986–992, October, 1940.

———, *Public Service and Special Training.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. ix + 83 pp.

Merrill, Maurice H., "Three Possible Approaches to the Study of Administrative Law." *Iowa Law Review*, 18: 228–232, January, 1933.

Moore, Clarence Carl, "The Educational Administrator and His Opportunities." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 23:622–632, November, 1937.

———, "The Superintendent's Professional Background." *School Executive*, 60:26–27, January, 1941.

———, "Superintendent's Certificates." *Nation's Schools*, 27: 49–50, February, 1941.

———, "Majors and Minors for Superintendents." *School Executive*, 60:17, March, 1941.

———, "The College Offering in School Administration." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 27:617–622, November, 1941.

Morstein Marx, Fritz, "The Study of Public Administration." Chap. II, in *Elements of Public Administration.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946. Pp. 27–57.

Mosher, William E., "Case Studies in Public Administration," *The American Political Science Review*, 33:66–68, February, 1939.

National Education Association Committee of Fifteen, "Report of Subcommittee on the Training of Teachers." *Educational Review*, 9:209–229, March, 1895. One section dealt with school economy.

North, Cecil C. (Chairman of Com.), "Report of Committee on the Introductory Course in Sociology." *Sociological Problems and Methods*, 27:136–138, December meeting of American Sociological Society, 1932.

Noyes, C. Reinold, "The Law and Scientific Method." *Political Science Quarterly*, 55:496–521, December, 1940.

Osborn, Fairfield, *Our Plundered Planet.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1948. xiv + 217 pp.

Pfiffner, John F., *Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946. Rev. ed. xii + 621 pp. See Chap. 2.

———, *Research Methods in Public Administration.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940. 447 pp.

Reining, Henry, Jr., "The University and Public Service." *Public Administration Review,* 1:298–300, Spring, 1941.

———, and Carl E. Stromsen, "An Approach to Public Service Teaching: Government Internship." *Public Personnel Review,* 3:190–199, July, 1942.

Robertson, Principal Grant, "The Future of Administrative Science." *Public Administration,* 4:8–11, 1926.

Rockwell, Landon G., "Toward a More Integrated Political Science Curriculum." *The American Political Science Review,* 41:314–320, April, 1947.

Rommel, Rowena Bellows, "The Making of Administrators." *Public Administration Review,* 2:113–115, Spring, 1942.

Rossiter, Clinton L., "Political Science and Political Indoctrination." *The American Political Science Review,* 42: 542–549, June, 1948.

Schweinburg, Eric F., *Law Training in Continental Europe: Its Principles and Public Function.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1945. 129 pp. See review of this in *The Yale Law Journal,* 56:415–423, January, 1947.

Sears, Jesse B., "A Program of Instruction for School Administrators." *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 35:129–149, March, 1949.

Simon, Herbert A., "A Comment on the Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 7:200–203, Summer, 1947.

Smith, Dan Throop, "Education for Administration." *Harvard Business Review,* 23:360–371, Spring, 1945.

Snedden, David, "The Fields and Problems of Educational Sociology." *Sociological Problems and Methods,* 27: 140–142, 1932.

Spaulding, Frank E., Wm. P. Burris, and Edward C. Elliott, *The Aims, Scope, and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration.* Report published by

National Society of College Teachers of Education, 1910. 94 pp.

Spencer, Richard C., "Significance of Functional Approach in the Introductory Course in Political Science." *The American Political Science Review,* 22:954–966, November, 1928.

Stahl, Glenn, O., "Public Service Training in Universities." *The American Political Science Review,* 31:870–878, October, 1937.

Strayer, George D., "Building the Profession of School Administration." *School Executives Magazine,* 56:248–250, March, 1937.

Tyler, Ralph S., "Training Administrative Officers for Democratic Leadership." In *Democratic Practices in School Administration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. 63–72.

Vanderbilt, Arthur T., "Judicial Administration in the Law School Curriculum." *Journal of the American Judicature Society,* 27:179–182, April, 1944.

Waldo, Dwight, *The Administrative State.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948. vi + 227 pp.

Warren, Roland L., "The Place of Values in Social Theory." *Journal of Social Philosophy and Jurisprudence* 7:223–239, April, 1942.

Wengert, Egbert S., "The Study of Public Administration." *The American Political Science Review,* 36:313-322, April, 1942.

White, Howard, "Selecting and Training Prospective Public Administrators." *American Association of Collegiate Registrars Journal,* 21:33–45, October, 1945.

Wilcox, Francis O., "Teaching Political Science in a World at War." *The American Political Science Review,* 35:325–333, April, 1941.

——, *et al.,* "Undergraduate Instruction in Political Science." *The American Political Science Review,* 41:489–534, June, 1947.

Wilson, Woodrow, "The Study of Administration." *Political Science Quarterly,* 2:197–222, June, 1887. Reprinted, 56:481–506, December, 1941.

Wingo, Otis T., "Training for Public Administration." *Journal of Higher Education,* 8:84–88, February, 1937.

Zimmerman, Carl C., "The Content of Rural Sociology." *Sociological Problems and Methods,* 27:139–140, 1932.

INDEX

A

Accidents (*see* Emergencies)
Accounting system, 224–225, 233, 295, 297, 416
Acheson Report, 304
Administration, and adjudication, 514
  as art, 21, 143, 314, 390, 470, 544, 547, 550
  authoritarian, 133, 302, 469
  as behavior, 139–140, 153*n.*, 359, 420, 489, 527–529, 535–537, 556
  and business, 7, 8, 41, 176, 520–523
  complexity of, 52–53, 84, 117, 151, 358–359, 379–383, 514, 531, 538–540
  concepts of, 5, 8, 10, 13–17, 19, 44, 45, 99–101, 130, 176, 195, 302, 338–339, 396–397, 467–470, 527, 528, 550–551
  as control (*see* Control)
  as coordination (*see* Coordination)
  criticisms of, 281, 304, 359, 361, 375, 378, 438, 560
  and culture pattern, 367, 368, 377, 514, 516, 525–537, 540
  cycle of activities in, 532, 535–537, 544
  decision in, 65, 90, 279, 284, 540
  definition of, 4, 7, 10, 21, 22, 24, 27–29, 40, 126–128, 212, 441, 527–528
  devices in (*see* Administrative devices and techniques)
  as direction (*see* Direction)
  efficiency and economy in, 88, 114, 132, 176, 200, 224, 228*n.*, 330, 352, 471, 513, 523, 557
  essential for institutions, 8, 27
  ethics in, 358*n.*
    (*See also* Culture pattern; Professional ethics; Responsibility)
Administration, evaluation of, 13–16, 18, 23–30, 93–98, 104, 143, 145, 146, 158, 164, 170, 176, 184–197, 203, 206–207, 220, 226, 237, 244, 302, 520–523, 541
  as extension of law (*see* Law)
  form of power for use in, choice of, 237–240, 540
  function of, in legislation, 395–444, 493, 495
    origin of, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19–23, 25–29, 41, 135, 175, 254, 316, 376, 456–457, 529, 532, 535, 550
    (*See also* Board of education; Legislation; Policy; Rules and regulations)
  and instruction, 3, 13, 14, 26, 28, 30, 44, 66, 96, 97, 151, 165, 168, 172, 176, 297, 347, 401–402, 480–483, 495, 529–531, 537–538, 543–544, 552
  interference with, 24, 25, 57, 69–70, 98, 108, 121, 136*n.*, 210, 281, 321*n.*, 369, 378–379, 472
  knowledge, place of in, 116*n.*
  as means not end, 23, 24, 26–28, 40–41, 91–92, 100, 164, 468, 492, 537
  as mechanism, 3, 9, 13, 14*n.*, 22, 31, 33, 35, 36, 99, 115, 146, 147, 200, 303, 358, 489, 513, 551
    (*See also* Organization)
  necessity for learning processes of, 10, 28, 368, 569
  objectives of, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11–12, 14, 20, 22, 23, 25, 35, 36, 45, 63, 91, 99, 170, 178, 189, 193, 204
  as organization, 87–122
  philosophy of, 5, 6, 45–46, 49–51, 83–84, 133, 483–485, 492, 510–513, 520–523
  as planning, 39–85

Administration, and policy making, 307–355
(*See also* Board of education; Legislation; Policy; Rules and regulations)
as power, 24, 29, 31, 100, 133, 138, 253–254, 265, 490, 517, 536, 540
as a process, 14, 19, 21, 22, 26, 29–31, 51–54, 99–101, 128–133, 170, 174, 181, 195, 208, 348, 398–400, 402, 448–453, 489–490, 536, 540, 543, 545, 551, 556, 563
psychology in, 544
requirements for, imagination, 64, 324, 533
judgment, 50, 51, 70, 75, 90, 142, 143, 154, 157, 203, 229, 276, 324, 465, 496, 521, 540
as rule by man, 132, 157, 266, 268–269, 274, 281, 320, 360, 513–518, 548, 558
rules for, (*see* Rules and regulations)
science of, 5, 7, 14*n.*, 15, 16, 20*n.*, 21, 23, 26, 28, 33, 37, 48–49, 51–54, 58–60, 65–68, 83–84, 126–129, 133, 176, 190, 195, 213, 316, 368, 390, 464, 465, 521, 528, 547, 550, 552, 569
similarities of, in different fields, 4, 7, 151, 207, 547
and social change, 28, 39, 44–48, 83, 99–101, 101*n.*, 107, 142, 173, 174, 177–180, 189–191, 194, 237, 260, 264, 289, 380, 404, 516–520, 531–533, 567
and social philosophy, 44–49, 52, 83, 95–97, 172, 230, 379, 408, 480–483, 505, 514–518, 525–527, 533–538, 547–552
specialization in, 6, 26, 176, 498
and the state, 6–8, 17, 18, 26, 34, 41, 44, 49, 52, 83, 95–97, 131*n.*, 133, 136*n.*, 172, 182, 183, 188, 249–250, 259, 264, 284–285, 289*n.*, 308–309, 311, 334*n.*, 463, 479–483, 495, 509–510, 514–518, 548, 552, 563
teachers, place of, in, 176, 272–273, 347, 401–402, 531, 538
theory of, 5, 7, 9–17, 19, 20, 23, 32, 41, 45, 58, 73, 81, 88*n.*, 93–97, 105, 109–111, 119, 134, 137–139, 153, 284, 290, 302, 311, 467–472, 511*n.*, 531–533, 538, 540, 550, 557, 563
(*See also* Authority; Democracy in Administration; Law, nature of)
values back of, 50, 71–76, 93–98, 100, 108–109, 133, 188, 212, 318, 326, 338, 386, 522, 533, 557
Administrative boards, 405, 409, 422, 514
as government agencies, 285, 398, 401
comparison between, 399
nature of rules, enacted by, 399*n.*, 414–415
opposition of, to jurists, 518
powers of, 398, 399
rapid growth in use of, 291*n.*, 473
types of, 399, 400
Administrative devices and techniques, 7, 9, 18, 28, 88–91, 130, 169, 177, 181–184, 188, 200, 204, 207, 219, 221, 388, 416, 468, 495, 537, 539, 543, 568
for application, of knowledge, 184, 208, 225, 276
of law, 183, 185–186, 208, 241, 324, 395
of social standards, 185, 227–229, 232–233
case precedents as, 291, 321–322, 339
choice of, 241, 246
and control, 213, 218–231, 233–235, 243, 246
development of, 189, 460
as established by board of education, 416
patterns and gadgets as, 10, 492, 497, 543, 562, 593
textbook discussion of, 497

Administrative devices and techniques, tricks as, 5, 35, 114, 543
See also Authority; Culture Pattern; Personality; Rules and regulations)
Administrative principles, 29, 35, 42, 96–97, 200, 211, 235, 241, 288, 311, 322, 326, 332, 373–374, 395, 524, 533–535, 540–542, 552
vs. assumptions, 13–16, 93
basis of action in, 6, 11, 22, 25–29, 41, 48, 60, 79, 80, 82, 85, 103, 140, 176, 238
of compromise, 339
(*See also* Professional ethics)
of control, 225, 235
and division of labor, 93, 113, 120, 128, 155, 283, 286–288, 290, 396–397, 432, 527
in organization, 90, 93, 131*n.*
and relation of planning to performance, 71–76, 81–82
(*See also* Administration)
and separation of powers, 131*n.*, 404-406, 443, 514
and unity, 79, 101, 108, 119, 121, 123, 273, 297, 348, 349, 401–402
Almack, John C., 499*n.*
American Association of School Administrators, 454*n.*
American Bar Association, 304*n.*
Ames, James Barr, 182*n.*, 366*n.*
Anderson, William, 13*n.*, 118*n.*, 304*n.*
Architecture, 68, 193, 229
Aristotle's *Politics*, 23*n.*, 263*n.*, 312*n.*
Arkin, H., 358*n.*
Assignment to duty, 77, 100, 112, 113, 115, 116, 118, 121, 128–130, 136, 138, 154, 163, 178, 183, 236, 284, 303, 305
choice for, 71–75
clarity of, importance of, 303, 305, 388
through organization, 223, 351, 353
Assumptions, 12–16, 93, 94, 103, 289, 396, 470–472, 483
Attendance, 230, 519
Audit, 163, 203, 225, 238
Authority, 22, 23, 30, 35, 72, 116*n.*, 127–128, 250, 252, 308, 551
abuses of, 97, 110, 114, 115, 122, 134, 136, 137, 143, 145–146, 249, 268–269, 272–281, 290, 297, 302, 363–364, 374–375, 407, 541, 548
as applied by man, 216, 236, 240, 242, 285, 290, 298–300, 304 374–375
attitudes toward, 97–99, 117, 211, 224, 251, 258, 260–265, 267, 298, 375
of autocracy (*see* Autocracy)
behavior of, 87, 110, 144, 223, 227–229, 259, 269–270, 283, 288
centralized, or distributed, 61, 94, 110, 147, 150, 151, 153–154, 162, 183
choosing form of, 237, 240, 540
combinations of forms of, 111, 138, 156, 188, 249–250, 253–255, 270–277, 284
to command, 100, 109, 120, 136, 156, 187, 250, 252, 256, 262, 269, 281, 287, 299–300
of control (*see* Control; Law; Policy)
delegated (*see* Delegation of authority)
of democracy, 87, 93, 94, 109, 133–134, 154, 299–300
devices for applying (*see* Administrative devices and techniques)
in direction, 127, 130, 133, 135, 137, 143–146, 150, 153, 154, 158, 159, 273, 279, 300, 320, 539
discretionary, 41, 109, 110, 117, 137, 153, 157, 250, 255, 266–269, 281, 284, 287, 289*n.*, 298, 300, 310, 314, 360–364, 517
of employees, 61, 109, 110, 154, 255, 256, 271, 272, 296
of government, 49, 109, 250, 252, 255, 258, 261, 266, 270, 284, 288

Authority, to inspect, 159
(*See also* Board of education, inspectional function of; Inspection)
knowledge as, 13, 14, 34, 41, 61, 72, 115, 118, 120, 133, 137, 138, 156, 167–168, 184, 188–190, 211–215, 231–232, 236, 241, 249, 253, 266, 269, 272, 274, 296, 299, 303, 366, 369, 374–375, 381, 429, 448
law as, 9, 14, 34, 49, 62, 108, 109, 111, 116, 136, 156, 167, 182, 187, 208, 209, 249, 250–251, 253, 254–265, 274, 284, 288, 296, 300, 317–319, 449
to legislate, 395–444
legislative and/or administrative, 422
for line function, 294
nature of, 22*n.*, 108, 110, 134, 153, 155, 249–281, 284–285, 288, 360, 490–492, 532, 545, 557
official not personal, 110, 134, 136, 137, 145, 209–210, 251, 252, 258, 265, 266, 283, 287–288, 296, 299, 300, 468–472
of organization (*see* Law; Organization)
to penalize, 136–137, 144, 158, 186–188, 285
personality as, 20, 136, 144, 153, 157, 238, 240, 252–253, 257, 261–263, 266, 268, 269, 274, 277, 280, 299, 360–366, 390–393, 449
placement and flow of, 49, 100, 110, 111, 116–118, 134, 149, 150, 152–153, 157–159, 221, 223, 244, 251, 256, 266, 269, 273, 277–279, 283, 290, 294, 297–298, 303–304, 352, 379, 386, 397, 519, 536
in planning, 40, 49, 61, 72, 156, 209, 375
proneness to use of, 127, 290, 300, 363, 371
and public opinion (*see* Public opinion)

Authority, relation of, to nature of task, 150, 238–240, 258, 272–277, 286, 288, 290
to responsibility, 71–75, 108, 114, 117, 136, 138, 144, 154, 156, 251*n.*, 267, 272, 288, 290, 292, 303, 360, 390–393
to restrain, 100, 136, 243, 285
sharing of, 361, 422
social usage as, 89, 90, 168, 185, 190–191, 236–237, 250, 253, 361, 365–368, 382, 448–449
unity of, 31, 94, 100, 120, 152, 158, 257–259, 297, 299
wrong distribution of, 290, 297
(*See also* Delegation of authority; Direction; Legislation; Policy; Principles of Administration)
Autocracy, 13–16, 87, 93–95, 111, 133, 299, 467–472, 557, 558
authority of, 87, 93, 94, 135, 149, 151, 299–300, 469–472
in direction, 135
in organization, 93, 97
place of, in study of administration, 467–470, 548, 551
proneness to use of, 97–99

B

Baker, John C., 396*n.*
Baldwin, Joseph M., 454*n.*
Barnard, Chester I., 95*n.*
Bateson, William, 89*n.*
Beard, Charles Austin, 6*n.*
Bentham, Jeremy, 89*n.*, 251*n.*, 358*n.*
Bikle, Henry Wolf, 320*n.*
Blachly, Frederick F., 18*n.*, 93*n.*, 398*n.*, 511*n.*
Board of education, 60, 61, 88, 89, 108, 110, 117, 176, 219*n.*, 514
administration of, 435
authority of, 397–398, 422
book of minutes of, 332
choice of executive officer for, 403, 404, 412, 440–444
contact of, with schools, 403
delegation of authority by, 97, 111, 153, 175, 210, 291, 292, 417, 421
devices used by, 396*n.*, 416–418

Board of education, functions of, control, 325, 348–349, 411, 413
deliberative, 400, 420, 436, 437
inspectional, 324, 400, 413, 439–440
legislative, 291–292, 396, 400, 405, 411–414, 493
as governing agency, 381, 396
interpretation of law by, for schools, 210, 265, 291, 402, 403, 407, 412, 414
knowledge of, 156, 324, 400, 431
legality of executive acts, 156, 324, 403, 411, 412, 418, 420
liability of, 519
limits to service of, 397, 400–402
and other government agencies, 409, 410
place of, in administration, 399, 401
and policy making, 219*n.*, 324, 348–349, 381, 402, 411, 414, 420–421
powers of, 186, 265, 287, 291, 324, 381, 396–400, 402, 403, 442, 517, 519
problems of, and requirements of technical knowledge, 324–325, 381, 397, 404, 406, 421
procedure of, 223, 411–421, 434–436
and the public, 229–230, 409, 410, 421, 424, 428, 434, 436
relation of, to executive officer, 153, 291, 324, 381, 393, 397, 400, 402, 404–407, 420–421, 493, 517
to experts, 324, 396–397, 400, 406, 408–410
responsibility of, 412, 420-422
rules of (*see* Rules and regulations)
(*See also* Administration; Control; Law; Policy)
Budget, 18, 28, 32, 36, 56, 70, 72, 90, 105, 107, 140, 279, 335, 502, 524, 538
as control instrument, 207, 219, 224, 301, 416, 478
enaction of, 437
and instruction program, 181
Budget, as plan of instruction and management, 163
preparation of, 165, 224
(*See also* Control; Coordination)
Building program, 329, 436
as means of control, 229–230
Buildings, 17, 28, 30, 35, 52, 63, 65, 108, 171
blueprints for, 225, 240
contracts for, 437
operation and maintenance of, 163, 230
planning for, 57, 63–69, 165, 176–177, 329, 406–407
relation of, to instruction program, 334
safety of, 55
Bureaucracy, 402
Burris, W. P., 458*n.*
Business forms, 225
(*See also* Administrative devices and techniques)
Business management, 17 35, 171, 176, 225, 295, 498–499, 520-523, 538, 554
place of law in, 352
procedures in, 353–355
school and private, 352
subordination of, to needs of instruction, 353
(*See also* Policy; Rules and regulations)
Butler, Nicholas Murray, 455*n.*

C

Cafeteria, 68, 171
Capp, A. G., 222*n.*, 415*n.*
Cardozo, Benjamin N., 23*n.*, 47*n.*, 140*n.*, 259*n.*, 309*n.*, 383*n.*, 405*n.*, 515*n.*
Career, 371, 372
Carlan, Edwin Norman, 309*n.*
Carpenter, W. W., 222*n.*, 415*n.*
Carson, John J., 147*n.*
Case of *Bohn v. Stubblefield,* 111*n.*, 288*n.*, 469*n.*
Central office, 147, 150–152, 156, 159
Chancellor, William E., 459*n.*
Chapman, Harold B., 80*n.*
Children, classification of, 538–540

Christie, Charles, 310*n.*
Chroust, Anton H., 116*n.*
Clapp, Gordon D., 14*n.*, 473*n.*
Class register, 235
Cocking, Walter D., 462*n.*
Cohen, Felix S., 259*n.*
Cole, Taylor, 149*n.*
Comer, John Preston, 399*n.*
Committees, 33, 40, 60, 78–80, 83, 85, 91, 99, 142, 542
  administration through, 157–159, 290, 297
  in board-of-education work, 437
Communication, 107, 110, 120, 150, 172, 277, 302, 385, 475
  records and reports as means of, 184
Contracts, 70, 81, 121, 223, 225, 237 ,240, 401, 406–407, 437, 510, 519, 520
Control, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36–37, 127, 130, 158, 162–163, 183, 203–246, 309, 343–345
  application of authority as, 100, 204, 206–209, 215, 224, 237
  audit as means of, 163
  through budget, 219–221
  through building program, 229
  central, 46, 150, 349
  choice of power for, 238
  custom, tradition, and ethics as means for, 185–206, 207, 215–217, 221, 232, 243, 245, 263, 265–266, 382–385
  dead-hand, 475
  by decisions, 210
  definition of, 203–205, 209–210, 212*n.*, 218, 243
  devices and methods for, 185, 203, 211, 218–246
    (*See also* Administrative devices and techniques; Budget; Curriculum; Policy; Rules and regulations; Salary schedule)
  different forms of, in practice, 239
  direct and indirect, 36, 203, 206, 219, 228, 300–301
  elements of, 204, 244
  by facts or theories, 206, 208, 211, 213–215, 221, 227, 231–232, 245
Control, in hierarchy, 152
  human element in, 240, 244–245, 308–314, 357–373
    (*See also* Culture pattern)
  by inspection, 413
  by laws, rules, or policies, 206, 208–211, 223–235, 244, 349, 364–366, 397, 413
  legislative, 206, 396–397
  by man, 215–217, 237
  of materials, 206
  misuse of, 157, 221
  where needed, 207–209, 219, 314
  by norms, formulae, or standards, 208, 210, 227
  objectives of, 36, 204–205, 208–209, 212
  of people, 206, 224, 231, 236, 257
  through personality, 185, 215, 237, 245, 314
  principles of, 235, 237
    (*see also* Administrative principles)
  as process, 204, 208, 219, 244
  of public attitude, 227, 240
    (*See also* Public relations)
  through program of instruction, 230–231
  relation of, to other activities, 149, 163, 205, 208, 218–231, 497, 513
  self-, 135, 146, 216–218, 227, 243–244, 363, 365–366, 541
  of staff turnover, 228
  study of, 204–222
    (*See also* Study of school administration)
Cooper, Robert M., 157*n.*
Coordination, 2, 30, 31, 34–37, 100, 127, 152, 160–201
  in adding new features, 180, 194
  in advance, 164–165, 169–170, 173–175, 177, 180, 194–197, 397
  in altering established practice, 173–174, 177–180, 194
  authority for, 181, 182, 196, 303
  as basis for evaluation of work, 164, 181, 198
  definition of, 162–163, 164–165, 170, 177, 180, 192–194, 197, 204

Coordination, as end or means, 164, 166, 169, 176–177, 181, 194, 196
essential factors in, 167–169
evaluation of, 181, 187, 198
of forces, 164, 174, 179, 181, 191–192, 196
interest, personality, and character in, 167, 174, 177–180, 182, 188–189, 191, 194
need for, in social and scientific change, 169, 174, 178, 194
of parts, 164, 170, 177, 180, 191, 193–194
between people, 167, 174, 179, 191, 257
prevention of incompetency through, 169, 174–176, 178–180, 195–197
principles of, 35, 164, 167, 176, 190, 192
problems of, 163–166, 168–169, 171–173, 175, 177, 180, 189, 194, 198–201
of processes, 164, 171, 176, 179, 180, 194–195, 197
and the public, 172
relation of, to administrative activities, 149, 162–165, 169, 170, 176, 180, 193, 196, 198, 205, 208, 397
study of, 164, 165–168, 170, 173, 176, 180, 181, 194–196, 197–201
techniques of, 35, 169, 181, 184–185
through knowledge and skills, 167, 169, 176, 185, 188, 190, 194
through legal authority, 167–168, 185–188, 194, 257
through records and reports, 189
through social and professional standards, 167, 169
Copeland, Melvin T., 219*n.*, 310*n.*, 407*n.*
Corbeiller, Philippe, 475*n.*
Costs, 60, 213, 230
(*See also* Control)
Coudert, Frederick R., 46*n.*, 182*n.*, 366*n.*, 516*n.*
Counselling (*see* Guidance)
Criticism, 301, 438
Culture pattern as factor in administration, 6*n*, 8, 14*n.*, 24, 34, 39, 50, 89–90
as administrative control, 227–228, 365, 366, 369, 382–385, 476, 527–528, 533
and biological factor, 215, 359, 360–365, 367–369, 525–526, 529
compelling power of, 89, 191, 260, 358, 365, 382–385, 527, 531
and desire for personal security, 360–364, 367
development of, 260, 271, 367–368
dynamic nature of, 365, 527–528
effective use of, 365–366, 382–385, 387–390, 408, 476
as factor, in coordination, 172, 177–179, 182, 190, 359
in organization, 89, 95–97, 99–101, 292–293, 527–529
in planning, 45–84
human nature and, 44–48, 89–101, 215–216, 314–319, 358–359, 361, 362*n.*, 363–364, 367, 376–377, 382
judgment, character, and, 385–386
and laws, 182, 254–265, 283, 309, 360, 365, 377*n.*, 405, 408
method of applying, in administration, 383, 387, 476
(*See also* Administrative devices and techniques)
and penalties for breaches of, 383–385
and professional ethics, 191, 207, 382
religion as element in, 259
school as feature of, 369, 527
shaping of, 389, 525
and social progress, 44–48, 100*n.*, 179, 191, 260, 264, 293, 309, 404, 476–478, 530
and social solidarity, 44–48, 191, 227, 293, 531
and technical knowledge, 369, 386, 476

Culture pattern as factor in administration, values underlying, 367, 386
Curriculum, 27, 30, 33, 35, 49–51, 56, 58, 71, 78–79, 89, 91, 99, 155, 156, 164, 165, 167, 171, 275
as administrative instrument, 233, 242
board of education and, 412, 416
as control device, 205, 207, 208, 219
formation of, 275
regulations governing, 184, 206, 321
university, 523
Cushman, Robert E., 398*n.*, 577*n.*
Custodial service, 323

D

Daily time schedule, 163, 166, 185, 223, 234, 273, 323, 416
Davison, J. Forrester, 360
Debt, 75, 323
Decision, 8, 65, 90, 108–109, 132, 140, 146, 157, 159, 175, 179, 187, 249–259, 279, 284, 294, 296, 313, 350, 375–376, 400, 444, 536–537, 538, 544
(*See also* Administration; Direction; Legislation)
Delegation of authority, 71–75, 97, 111, 148, 152, 283–305
complexity of, 283, 296–298
(*See also* Administration)
control of, by facts, 300–303
in democracy vs. autocracy, 298–300
(*See also* Democracy in administration)
and flow of information and knowledge, 298–299
limitation of power for, 291, 303
to line and staff officers, 294
purposes of, need for clarity in, 303–305
by rule or discretion, 294
steps involved in, 283, 293–305
in terms of nature of work, 288, 290, 294
(*See also* Administrative principles)
Delegation of Authority, in terms of specific functions, 292, 294, 298
wrong kinds of, 290, 298, 375
(*See also* Authority; Direction; Law; Policy; Rules and regulations)
Democracy in administration, 13–18, 44, 49–51, 79*n.*, 83, 95–97, 122, 133, 143, 189, 229, 230*n.*, 264, 299, 339, 463, 466*n.*, 481–482, 533, 548, 558
basis of, 293*n.*, 342
as combination of knowledge and authority, 299
freedom in, 360
and use of facts and principles, 299, 342
and use of hierarchy for flow of knowledge, 299
and use of rule-by-law principle, 342
weaknesses of, 94, 95*n.*
(*See also* Authority; Autocracy; Hierarchy)
Dewey, John, 261*n.*, 293*n.*, 360*n.*, 511*n.*, 577*n.*
DeYoung, Chris A., 498*n.*
Dickinson, John, 206*n.*, 517*n.*
Dimock, Marshall E., 5*n.*, 11*n.*, 99*n.*, 115*n.*, 128*n.*, 131*n.*, 310*n.*, 578*n.*, 597*n.*
Direction, 1, 13, 28, 31, 34, 36, 61, 65, 125–160, 299, 333
activities used in, 131–133, 139, 154, 157–160
administration as, 125–160
advantage of written, 141, 300
analysis of, 131, 132, 134
authority in (*see* Authority)
as behavior, 139–140
of board-of-education work, 435
(*See also* Board of education)
centralization of, 148, 150–153, 157
communication in, 131, 139, 141–143
by compulsion, 158
definition of, 5, 125–128, 131, 134
effects of, executive, 139, 141, 143–146, 150, 152–154, 159, 174
evaluation of, 132, 145–146, 539

Direction, factors involved in, 125–126, 137–139, 146, 148, 152–156, 159, 300
forms of, 126
general and specific, 140
as intellectual activity, 156
as key function in administration, 133, 143, 147
manner of giving, importance of, 144
mechanism for (*see* Administration, as mechanism; Hierarchy)
necessity for certainty and speed in, 157
by people direct, 129, 133, 143 (*See also* District meeting)
personal element in, 129–130, 134–135, 137, 139, 141–145, 153–155, 157, 231–232, 320
and redirection, 159, 174
relation of, to other phases of administration, 126, 127, 131, 133–135, 142, 147, 149, 169, 196, 197, 205, 208, 397
research in (*see* Research)
self- , 65, 108, 135, 136*n.*, 146, 154, 158, 360
techniques of, 126, 146
theory of, 139, 153–155, 160
and work directed, 134, 138, 140, 539
(*See also* Administration; Board of Education; Inspection; Policy)
Director, 34, 126, 143, 144, 154, 156–158, 162, 194
(*See also* Administration; Authority; Direction; Superintendent)
Discipline, 539, 543
District, 175, 258, 288–291, 304, 310, 518
large and small, 152, 332–341
organization of, 107
as part of state, 308
powers of, 510
as unit of local government, 511–512
District meeting, 108, 143*n.*, 340, 518

E

Education, general, 230–231, 463, 478–480, 508–510, 523, 542, 543, 566
Edwards, Newton, 287*n.*, 403*n.*, 510*n.*, 515*n.*
Elliott, Edward C., 458*n.*
Emergencies, 54, 287
Employment, eligibility for, 323
Engelhardt, Fred, 498*n.*
Executive, 33, 34, 51, 60–62, 65, 90, 95, 117, 131, 176, 186, 268, 272, 359, 397, 433, 536
and board-of-education hearings, 434
control of, 226, 319, 469
discretionary power of, 267
and legislation, 421
responsibility of, 290, 403, 421
(*See also* Authority; Board of Education; Control; Direction; Responsibility)
Experience, 104, 109, 112, 113, 148, 151, 159, 227, 300, 322–323, 331, 464
Expertness, 294, 406, 540
use of, in legislation, 400, 401–402, 404
(*See also* Research)

F

Faculty (*see* Personnel)
Fairlie, John A., 5*n.*
Fayol, Henri, 32*n.*, 40*n*, 88*n.*, 126*n.*
Field of administration, 4, 10, 11, 16, 170, 307–310, 515
Filing system, 226, 297
Finer, Herman, 139*n.*
Fire drill, 17, 28, 35, 52, 60, 156, 171, 176, 224, 230, 416, 502, 508, 520
Follett, Mary Parker, 211*n.*
Follow-up (*see* Control; Inspection)
Fosdick, Dorothy, 207*n.*, 358*n.*
Fowlkes, John Guy, 499*n.*
Frank, Jerome, 23*n.*, 46*n.*, 264*n.*, 309*n.*, 438*n.*, 512*n.*, 515*n.*
Frankfurter, Felix, 95*n.*
Freedom of speech, 44, 302
Freund, Ernst, 291*n.*

Friedrich, Carl J., 149*n.*, 285*n.*
Fuchs, Ralph S., 316*n.*, 518*n.*
Fuller, Edgar, 403*n.*

G

Gantt, Henry L., 103*n.*
Garland, C. H., 452*n.*
Gaus, 13*n.*, 99*n.*, 118*n.*, 304*n.*
Gerard, Ralph W., 457*n.*
Gill, John, 454*n.*
Gladden, E. N., 16*n.*
Glaser, Comstock, 290*n.*
Green, Leon, 29*n.*, 291*n.*
Greene, David L., 337*n.*
Greenwood, J. M., 455*n.*
Grievances, 438
Griswold, Erwin N., 117*n.*, 402*n.*
Guidance, 4, 9, 17, 35, 49, 53, 56, 105, 167, 169, 171, 186, 191, 234, 275, 290, 514, 539
Gulick, Luther H., 4*n.*, 6*n.*, 40*n.*, 88*n.*, 101*n.*, 105*n.*, 118*n.*, 126*n.*, 211*n.*, 286*n.*, 294*n.*, 567*n.*

H

Hadley, Arthur Twining, 44*n.*, 581*n.*
Haines, Charles G., 5*n.*, 140*n.*, 317*n.*, 517*n.*, 519*n.*
Hale, George E., 436*n.*
Hamilton, Robert R., 285*n.*, 287*n.*
Hart, James, 110*n.*, 142*n.*
Havinghurst, Harold C., 358*n.*
Health service, 49, 53, 55, 67, 107, 148, 171, 295, 297, 323, 401, 410, 510, 519, 538, 551
Hearings, 434–436, 437, 438*n.*, 518
Herring, Edward P., 321*n.*
Hierarchy, 61, 82, 146, 148–152, 295, 302, 489
  of authority and of responsibility, 251
  control in, 153
  in democracy, 299
  strength and weaknesses of, 152, 153, 297
  studies of, cited, 149*n.*
  as useful concept in management, 149
  (*See also* Direction; Organization)
Hilary, H. O., 78*n.*, 290*n.*
Hoover study, 304*n.*, 467
Housing (*see* Buildings)
Humphrey, J. P., 406*n.*

I

In-service education, 75, 103, 171, 542
Inspection, 132, 135, 158, 198, 204, 295, 305, 514
  authority in, 159
  as board-of-education function, 399–402, 413
  as part of diagnosis in research, 194–197
  self- , 135
  (*See also* Control; Direction; Health service)
Insurance, 519
Inventories, 88, 235

J

Jackson, J. Hugh, 212*n.*
Jones, Victor, 107*n.*

K

Kellog, Amos M., 454*n.*
Keyser, Cassius J., 473*n.*
Konop, Thomas F., 19*n.*

L

Landis, James M., 19*n.*, 116*n.*, 382*n.*, 399*n.*, 507*n.*, 515*n.*
Latham, E., 439*n.*
Law, 14–15, 33, 35, 49, 58, 61, 62, 66, 83, 98, 108, 110, 120, 140, 169, 184–186, 208, 308, 317, 553
  and administration, 41, 66–68, 210, 310, 495, 513–520
    by man, 117, 156, 185, 187, 236, 252
  administrative, 518–520
  allowance for knowledge in, 41, 137–138, 154–156, 186, 252, 256, 314–315, 317, 319
  creation of authority by, 256
  and culture pattern, 140, 187, 254–265, 317, 365–366, 387–390

Law, devices for application of, 208, 236, 511
and direction, 231–232
discretion in use of, 109, 117, 187, 206, 255, 265, 360–364
effect of, on all functions, 14, 186, 210
forms of, 210, 236, 241
growth of, 157, 182*n.*, 187, 255, 259, 264, 265, 309, 318, 377–379, 383*n.*, 405, 514–516, 520, 531
of learning, 83, 495, 538, 542, 551
nature of, 41, 90, 116, 118, 136, 157, 182, 185–188, 209, 218, 252, 254–265, 287, 469, 471, 512, 514–516, 535, 551
(*See also* Authority)
necessity for general, 41, 43, 136, 138, 187, 208, 255, 272, 291, 320, 403, 512
and other authority, 250–254, 257, 270–272
penalizing, power of, 187, 205, 366, 513, 514
as plans or instructions, 139, 140, 184, 186, 210, 285
and power of employees, 209
relation of, to administration, 116, 139, 186, 209–211, 287, 513–516
for schools, specific, 186, 209–210, 252, 265, 288
and social progress, 44, 45–48, 259–265, 317, 514, 520
and social solidarity, 45, 46, 49, 186, 315, 519
as standard for judging action, 186, 210
(*See also* Authority; Legislation; Policy; Rules and regulations)
Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix, 118*n.*, 439*n.*
Leadership, 103, 144, 146, 230, 358, 370*n.*, 381, 388, 393, 421, 433, 533
Leaves of absence (*see* Rules and regulations; Salary schedule)
Lee, John, 5*n.*, 105*n.*, 286*n.*
Legislation, 43, 111, 142*n.*, 143*n.*, 265, 288, 291–292, 295, 316, 321*n.*, 375, 493, 495, 514
and adjudication, 398–399, 405, 438, 439
business, 418, 436–440
community interest in, 408–409, 419, 509
confusion of, with administration, 395, 401, 406
to decide cases, 420
definition of, 405, 423
deliberation essential in, 400–401
direct, 436*n.*
to effect control, 412–413
(*See also* Control; Law)
to establish devices, 420
to establish policy, 420
and executive responsibility, 374, 397, 399–401, 425–436, 440–444
experts essential in, 397, 399, 401, 403–404, 406–408, 423–425
field of, 406–409, 419, 423–425
methods of, 407, 410–421, 427–430, 434–436
nature of, creative, 399, 411–413
process of, 395, 396, 401–402, 406, 420, 423–440, 442
and public, 408, 423–424
relation of, to other government functions, 405, 406, 410, 509
and social progress, 404, 423–425
and state, 423, 524
three types of, 424
who participates in, 396, 406, 420–434, 442
(*See also* Administration; Law; Policy; Rules and regulations)
Leighton, Alexander H., 115*n.*, 368*n.*, 565*n.*
Leys, Wayne A. R., 361*n.*
Library, 28, 35, 50, 52, 67, 89, 91, 171, 181, 295, 417
card catalogue of, 56, 233–234, 243
devices for administering, 184, 416–417
Line service, 294
Linton, Ralph, 367*n.*, 532*n.*

Literature of administration, 6, 7, 396, 453–456, 461, 523, 553
bibliographies of, 574–592, 596–603
discussion of, 571–574, 592–596
not all in field of education, 571–572
organization of, 497–499, 515, 546–547
points of view stressed in, 17–19
source materials in, 568
(*See also* Subject matter of school administration)
Litigation, 403
Locke, John, *On Civil Government*, 23*n.*
Lowell, A. Lawrence, 123*n.*, 366*n.*
Loyalty, 299
Lund, John, 462*n.*

M

McGuire, O. R., 113*n.*
Machiavelli, Niccolo, 362*n.*
McIntire, John A., 142*n.*
Magaw, Elden S., 143*n.*
Malinowski, Bronislaw, 14*n.*, 368*n.*, 525*n.*
Marking system, 181, 207, 239
Mason, Edward S., 285*n.*
Merriam, Charles E., 17*n.*, 96*n.*
Merson, F., 7*n.*
Mill, James, 23*n.*, 136*n.*, 358*n.*
Mill, John Stuart, 23*n.*, 358*n.*
Moehlman, Arthur B., 20*n.*
Montesquieu, de, 533*n.*, 535
Mooney, James D., 101*n.*
Moore, Clarence Carl, 461*n.*
Moral standards (*see* Professional ethics)
Morale, of staff, 17, 18, 52, 143*n.*, 179–180, 200–201, 237, 301, 305, 380, 389
affect of, on coordination, 181, 303–304
on staff turnover, 229
sound, basis of, 305, 369, 388–390, 537
methods for achieving, 541–542
Morrison, Henry C., 498*n.*
Mort, Paul, 20*n.*, 285*n.*, 287*n.*
Mosher, William E., 567*n.*
Mulford, Herbert B., 317*n.*
Munro, William, B., 289*n.*, 402*n.*, 514*n.*

N

National Education Association, 455
National Society of College Teachers of Education, 458
Neal, Alfred C., 41*n.*
Newlan, Jesse H., 498*n.*
Noyes, C. Reinold, 8*n.*, 48*n.*

O

Oatman, M. E., 18*n.*, 93*n.*, 398*n.*, 511*n.*
Olsen, Hans C., 402*n.*
Organization, 1, 14, 28–31, 33, 41, 52, 60, 61, 63, 87–124, 128, 168, 169, 176, 180, 277, 350, 542
authority of, 100, 108–112, 114, 150–152, 286–287
centralized, 489
changes made in, 93, 105, 122, 294
as channels for flow, of authority, 300, 304
of knowledge, 300, 302, 386–387
of social forces, 387–389
chart of, 181, 183, 225
for command, 147
custom and propriety, role of, in, 89, 91–101, 193–404
definition and uses of term, 88–91, 99–101, 122
factors affecting, 89, 91, 93–100, 102, 104, 106, 111, 115, 122–123
of facts and ideas, 88, 90, 91
foundations of, 101, 111, 151, 295–296
functional type of, 104–107, 113, 122, 128–131, 150, 152, 294–296
geographical basis of, 104, 107, 150–151
hierarchic, 146, 150, 296–299, 489
individual in, 77, 87, 98–103, 146, 192, 538–539

Organization, and legislative process, 413, 427
lines of cleavage in, 150, 305, 351, 362, 395–397, 405
of materials, 88, 224
as means, not end, 98, 121
need for, 5, 87, 88, 92, 102, 103, 108, 121, 208, 294, 350
noun and verb, 33, 87, 90
of people, 88, 91, 99, 102, 122, 192, 305
power of, 100, 101, 109, 111, 117, 286
principles of, 90-91, 119–121, 350, 538–540
of procedures, 89, 102, 223, 539
provision by, for flow of knowledge and authority, 300–303
purposes of, 88, 98, 99, 102, 111, 119, 121, 152
regulations governing, 223–235, 305
relation of, to other phases of administration, 99–101, 147, 149, 169, 197, 198, 205, 208, 277
theory of, 87, 89*n.*, 93–97, 111, 115, 119, 121, 152, 539–540
types of, 99, 122
weaknesses in, 106, 122, 351
(*See also* Administration; Paper machinery; Records and reports; Rules and regulations)
Osborn, Fairfield, 526*n.*

P

Paper machinery, 87, 91–93, 102, 107, 181, 273
advantages of, 92, 94
impersonal nature of, 93·
(*See also* Administration, mechanism of; Organization; Records and Reports; Rules and regulations)
Parent-teacher organizations, 409
Payne, William H., 454*n.*
Payroll, 225, 287, 416
Pearson, Norman M., 91*n.*, 132*n.*
Peikelis, Alexander, 507*n.*
Pendleton, Herring, 406*n.*
Pension plan, 225, 227
People v. Lovellette, 291*n.*
Person, H. S., 294*n.*
Personality, 20, 24, 25, 34, 35, 37, 44–48, 62*n.*, 67, 104, 114, 153, 185, 192, 237, 268, 303, 313, 376–433
in autocracy, 94, 98
in coordination, 167, 169, 178, 180, 182, 185, 191–192, 303
in directing, 144, 157, 386
effect of, on school work, 192
as factor in administration, 37, 61, 65, 98–101, 130, 155–156, 178, 180, 191, 240, 314–316, 360–366, 386, 388, 390–393, 496, 531–532, 536–538, 540
and law observance, 261, 283, 386–387
in planning, 62, 64–65, 71–76, 85
pschology of, necessity for, in subject matter of administration, 537–543, 556
relation of, to culture pattern, 98, 183, 185, 533–535
and school policy, 310–311
and will to cooperate, 303, 362–363, 390–393
(*See also* Study of school administration; Subject matter of school administration)
Personnel, 18, 52, 58, 60, 64, 79, 108, 122, 133, 170, 324, 342, 349, 523
attracting and holding, 52–53, 71–75, 228
board of education and, 404
choice of people for, 71–75, 122, 192, 323, 351, 372–373
and creation of authority, 116
employment of, 192, 323, 351
for large and small districts, 336
management of (*see* Administration; Administrative devices and techniques; Control; Rules and regulations)
morale of, 71, 143
organization of, 28, 88, 116, 324, 343, 351
promotion of, 351
records of, 171, 234

Personnel, rules governing, 223, 351–352, 478
(*See also* Rules and regulations)
Pfiffner, John M., 41*n.*, 292*n.*, 296*n.*
Philosophy of administration, 7, 9, 13, 26, 33, 44–48, 111, 133, 378
difficulty of applying, as guide to action, 189
human nature and, 45, 47
nature of culture as factor in, 45–47, 51
and political philosophy, 49, 50, 52, 83, 250
(*See also* Administration, theory of)
Physical education, 56
Planning, 1, 6, 28, 32, 34, 39–85, 127, 131, 140, 157, 162, 171, 173, 176, 237, 289, 294
arrangements for, 76, 81–82
authority in, 62–63, 72–74, 84, 155
by committees, 40, 60, 77, 78, 82, 85
and culture pattern, 44–48, 379
definition of, 40, 58, 72, 83, 84
democracy in, 40, 44, 45, 71, 143, 327
difficulty of, 40, 44, 48, 61, 66–71, 75, 327
economy in, 73
effect of law on, 42, 44, 54, 65, 83
emergency, 54–56
external factors that affect, 75–76
and human element, 44–48, 62–63, 65, 69, 71, 84, 143, 208, 316, 376–380
and instructional service, 50, 58–69
an intellectual activity, 41, 62, 64–65, 79, 85, 155
through legislation, 157, 397
long- and short-term, 40, 53, 65, 74, 380
as means, not end, 40, 41, 60
and nature of education, 41–42, 48, 64, 69, 71, 84, 327–328
Planning, need for, 41–54, 55–58, 59, 60, 63, 69, 70, 71–76, 82, 83, 380, 539
origin of, 39, 41, 59, 60, 66
plans and, 9, 41, 68, 70, 72, 93, 104, 139, 180, 208, 231
and philosophy of administration, 48–51, 54, 83–84, 327–328
positive, 55–57
as preparation for action, 40, 71–76
relation of, to execution, 72–75, 81, 134, 143
to future, 42, 51, 71
to other activities, 32, 39, 50, 54, 61, 70, 134, 139, 143, 149, 169, 170, 176, 180, 205
and replanning, 158
responsibility for, 39, 40, 62, 71, 77, 78, 80, 81
and social goals, 44–48, 83
stages in, 58–66, 327–328
three-dimensional nature of, 59, 69–73, 84
timing, 69, 70
by whom, 60, 61, 63–65, 69–75, 77, 81–83, 85, 143, 155, 326–328
(*See also* Research)
Plato's *Republic,* 23*n.*
Playgrounds, 30, 107
Policy, 15, 18, 30, 49, 63, 68, 79, 148, 150, 165–166, 169, 175, 193, 213, 241, 241, 287, 307–355, 413, 418–420, 542
case precedents as, 307, 321–322, 414
as characteristic of executive, 310–311, 313, 466
characterization of, 312, 314
as control, 224, 311, 320, 323, 324, 342–345, 349, 353
development of, 307–308, 310*n.*, 311, 320–322, 324–332, 345–355, 400, 414–415, 502, 518
district, 332–341
and educational science, 312, 315, 317, 320, 321, 342, 466
of expediency, 313*n.*
as extension of personality, 325–326

Policy, form of, 311, 314–315, 317, 319–320
functions of, 224, 319–320
general, 316, 341–348
and human nature, 315, 321–324
maintaining continuity of, 292, 307, 320, 321, 348
nature of, 307, 308, 310–311, 314–320, 323, 325–326, 328, 329, 333, 335
need for, 307, 314, 323, 328–329
permanency and elasticity in, 307, 315–317
and political and social philosophy, 312, 315*n.*, 318
power of, and law, 325
as principle of government, 307, 311–313
and problems, 308, 311, 314–315, 323, 345–355
and public relations, 320
relation of, to administrative devices, 312, 320, 323
to laws, 316–317, 320
to service administered, 325, 328–329, 341–348
for school staff (*see* Personnel; Rules and regulations)
uses of, in legislation, 348–349, 418–419
in school government, 223
term, use of, 310–314
values and dangers from, 312, 315, 321, 339
(*See also* Authority; Laws; Legislation; Rules and regulations)
Pope, Alexander, quoted, 94*n.*
Pound, Roscoe, 17*n.*, 23*n.*, 46*n.*, 140*n.*, 259*n.*, 309*n.*, 358*n.*, 405*n.*, 512*n.*
Powell, Thomas Reed, 131*n.*
Pressure groups, 269, 338, 404
Principal, 73, 82, 96, 97, 112, 128, 140, 142, 148, 155, 159, 172, 231, 278, 280, 292, 387
Profession, 390–393
Profession of education, 89, 116, 178, 371, 568
membership in, 390–393
Professional ethics, 35, 41, 71–76, 89, 154, 162–168, 177, 182, 190, 207, 240, 327–328, 387–392
administration by use of, 215, 237, 245, 382
for board of education members, 422
definition of, 207
development of code of, 392
nature of, 533–535, 544
and use of discretionary power, 360
Professional growth, 170, 179, 188
motivation of, 71–76
Professional opportunity, 71–76
Professional preparation, 4, 7, 10–12, 16, 17, 19, 23, 51, 71–76, 116, 170, 188
(*See also* Literature of administration; Study of school administration; Subject matter of school administration)
Professional recognition, 71–76, 154, 227, 233, 236
Professional relationship (*see* Professional ethics)
Professional work, 390, 568
Program of instruction, 289
as control device, 223, 230–231
(*See also* Curriculum)
Public opinion, 61, 123, 132, 267, 276, 309, 318–319, 365–366, 382, 408, 427, 509, 541, 544
Public relations, 10, 200, 201, 227–228, 319–321, 323, 409, 509, 542
board of education and, 404, 420, 424, 436*n.*
propaganda in work of, 509
Pupil self-government, 542
Purchasing, 176, 181, 349, 352, 437, 520, 524, 537–538

R

Raub, Albert N., 454*n.*
Records and reports, 17, 18, 53, 176–177, 184, 189, 200, 234, 378, 416, 520
(*See also* Organization; Paper machinery)
Reeder, Ward G., 404*n.*, 449*n.*

Report card, 159, 172, 189, 234, 235, 416
Research, 9, 10, 17, 28, 41, 56, 65, 66, 105, 113, 128, 138*n.*, 151, 295, 374, 388, 499, 569
  authority in, 81, 277, 294
  beginnings of, in education, 80, 289
  cooperative work in, 176
  in coordination, 169, 171, 176–177, 181
  department of, 177, 294
  in diagnosis of problems, 194–197, 238, 509, 543
  literature on, 58*n.*
  nature of, 296–297, 452
  in planning, 41, 60, 71, 80–81, 156
  specialists in, 80
    function of, and others, 294
Responsibility, 71–74, 77, 78, 82, 100, 111–113, 118, 120, 122, 142, 144, 146, 170, 251, 274, 352
  aids to assure, 361, 364–370, 372, 384
  and authority, 137, 213–214, 251, 300, 359–360, 379, 540
  centralized, *vs.* distributed, 147, 170
  clarity in assignment of, necessity for, 303
  compelling, 121, 357, 362, 364–365, 393
  and culture pattern, 365, 367–370, 390–393
  discretion and, 360–364
  division of, 159
  dodging, 359, 362, 384
  encouraging, 357, 367–370
  and executives, 170, 380–382, 540
  freedom and, 360–368, 391–393
  and human nature, 215, 359–366, 368–373, 376, 382, 392–393
  knowledge and, 118, 138, 217, 302, 326–327, 366, 378–379
  leadership in, 357, 380–381
  in legislation (*see* Board of education; Legislation)
  of membership in profession, 390–393
    (*See also* Professional ethics)
Responsibility, nature of, 115, 358, 360–373, 390–393
  personal security and, 360*n.*
  personal sense of, 178, 217, 357, 361, 370
  for proper flow of knowledge, 302, 369
  and rights, 73, 114, 178, 184, 327
  shifting of, with change in duties, 363
  will to assume, 357, 361, 362, 365, 370–373, 390–393
  (*See also* Authority; Democracy in administration)
Retirement, 53, 225
Richberg, Donald R., 47*n.*
Rights and duties (*see* Teachers)
Roberts, J. R. Howard, 41*n.*, 404*n.*
Robertson, Grant, 8*n.*, 129*n.*
Rockwell, Landon G., 563*n.*
Rosenberry, Marvin B., 110*n.*, 289*n.*
Rules and regulations, 14, 15, 33, 55, 63, 72, 89, 92, 109, 154, 156, 172, 213, 222–225, 332
  advantages of formal, 376–377, 380, 414, 428–429
  book of, 415
  case precedents in lieu of, 291, 307, 321–322, 339, 414, 427, 517
  as control, 223, 362, 411, 429
  defining educational purposes, 223, 343–345, 411, 415
  development of, 49, 222*n.*, 304, 322, 374, 376, 378–380, 414, 427–434
  as embodiment of administrative theory, 379, 418
  essentials of book of, 304–305, 308, 342–343, 379, 415–417, 429, 445
  extension of law by, 399*n.*, 415–416, 427–429, 510–512
  fear of, 276, 375–376, 414, 558–559
  as guide to action, 223, 342, 376–377, 414
  increase in use of, 291*n.*, 304*n.*, 514
  as limitation of discretion, 362, 429

Rules and regulations, preamble to code of, 341, 345
responsibility for establishing, 380, 411, 427–434
size of district as factor in preparing, 332–341
use of, in administrative law, 515, 518
in coordination, 181
(*See also* Administrative devices and techniques; Administrative principles; Authority; Law; Legislation; Policy)

S

Salary schedule, 33, 56, 107, 171, 181, 225, 524
attracting and holding talent by, 53, 227, 336–338
bases of increments in, 227, 311, 336–338
compensations outside, 371
as control device, 226, 229, 300–301
leaves of absence and, 336
planning, 73
regulations governing, 213, 226–229, 300, 323, 337*n.*
(*See also* Rules and regulations)
School bonds, 425, 442, 499, 519
School calendar, 73, 89, 171, 235, 354, 416
School elections, 419
School survey, 60*n.*, 80, 290, 351, 459–460, 523
School systems, 176, 186, 284–285, 342, 410, 511–513
Schools, and community, 50, 165, 207, 275, 289, 426, 464, 513
as exemplification of democracy, 409–410
as expressions of laws of state, 182, 186, 265, 472–473
and government, 409–410, 436, 471–473, 511
and home, 50, 165, 232, 275, 529, 536
nature of, 334, 341–342, 549
and people, 408, 436
as societies, 192, 529–531
and system of economy, 473–474
types of, 16
Sears, Jesse B., 11*n.*, 20*n.*, 26*n.*, 60*n.*, 118*n.*, 143*n.*, 204*n.*, 222*n.*, 314*n.*, 337*n.*, 340*n.*, 351*n.*, 362*n.*, 379*n.*, 396*n.*, 414*n.*, 415*n.*, 436*n.*, 448*n.*, 498*n.*, 512*n.*, 517*n.*, 518*n.*, 568*n.*
Secretarial service, 171, 295, 347
Separation of powers, 404–406
Sheldon, Oliver, 5*n.*, 7*n.*
Short-Conrad Co. v. San Claire School District, 469*n.*
Simon, Herbert A., 7*n.*, 108*n.*, 128*n.*, 132*n.*, 153*n.*, 453*n.*
Simon, Yves R., 291*n.*
Social program, 50, 417
Spaulding, Frank E., 458*n.*
Staff service, 105, 294, 295
(*See also* Planning; Research; Supervision)
Stene, Edwin O., 7*n.*, 12*n.*, 213*n.*, 567*n.*
Stoke, Harold W., 370*n.*
Study of school administration, 3–37, 164–165, 170, 205, 246, 270, 569
analysis of field for, 16, 22, 30, 242
approaches to, 11–14*n.*, 16–19, 21–23, 26, 58, 83–84, 165, 208–209, 569
beginnings and aims of, 19–21, 23, 25, 30–31
comparative, 4, 7, 10, 16, 42, 297
as individual problems, 28
on the job, 51, 165, 184, 188, 195, 198, 308
and knowledge of education, 48
mechanism as point of emphasis in, 29–31, 33
method of work in, 11–13, 19, 23*n.*, 566, 572–573
need for scientific, 19–21, 26–29
personality in, 24
power of command in, 29, 251
as process, 29–37
as science, 33
through study of administrative law, 517
(*See also* Assumptions; Literature of Administration; Subject matter of school administration)

Subject matter of school administration, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17, 22, 23, 51–54, 442, 603
from analysis of service to be administered, 465–467, 471–472, 475, 478, 538–539
approaches to study of, 488–492
arrangement of, for study, 497, 550, 569, 572–573, 594–595
from arts and sciences, 477–479, 523
assumptions affecting nature of, 472
for background and foundation, 493–496, 504–506, 542–544, 572
from business and industry, 489 513, 520–525, 549
contribution of testing movement to, 459
criteria for choice of, 9, 450, 453, 457–458, 462, 464–472, 474–479, 493, 547–548, 550
criticism of current, 499–503
definition of, 451, 463–465, 467–472, 479, 482, 547–548
determination of, by nature of administration, 9, 448, 453, 467–472, 478, 488, 491, 495–496, 513–520, 547–548, 550–551, 568
(*See also* Administrative principles)
early discussions of, 451, 453–461, 497, 562
early university courses in, 252, 257–258, 462
and educational philosophy, 462–463, 476–478, 481–483, 493, 505, 548, 549, 552
emphasis of, on practice, 456, 459–460, 462, 463, 465, 475, 478, 491
as indicated by certification requirements, 462
from knowledge of education, 451, 452, 464, 467, 468, 474-476, 478, 480–483, 488, 496, 543–544, 548–549, 560–562
and knowledges, skills, attitudes, and personality, 448–450, 465, 466, 468, 492, 503, 540–543, 547
from law, 448–449, 453, 464, 466, 468–469, 471, 473–474, 490, 510–520, 553, 563
mastery of, 28
order of importance in choice of, 480–483
overlapping of, 494
from political science, 451, 457, 464, 472, 474, 478, 480–483, 489, 493, 496, 504–505, 548, 551, 563, 571–574, 595–596
from psychology, 99–101, 104, 464, 481–485, 495, 530, 535–544, 548, 551, 556, 565
from public administration, 453, 478, 490, 506–508, 513, 552, 571–573, 593–595
and religion, 474, 481, 494, 527
research as help in developing, 459, 461–463, 499
and school survey, 459
science of administration, comparison with, 450, 465,
from sociology and anthropology, 115, 461, 464, 466, 468–469, 474–477, 490–491, 496, 525–535, 548, 551, 555, 560–561, 564
textbooks on, 20*n*., 489, 497, 524, 547
comments on, 452, 454*n*., 455, 458, 459, 460, 461, 463, 497–503, 568, 593
theory regarding nature of, 462, 465–472, 479–483, 546–551
in use now, 450, 497–504
values sought through, 447–448, 452, 456, 460, 463, 465, 475*n*., 504–505, 545, 546, 552, 560–561
(*See also* Literature of administration)
Superintendency, 60, 71, 73, 97, 117, 144, 148, 155, 159, 175, 273, 280, 287, 292, 396, 420, 421, 436, 536
√Supervision, 10, 17, 49, 118, 128, 156, 159, 166, 181, 290, 295, 297, 454–457, 462, 539–540

T

Taylor, Frederick Winslow, 21*n.*, 91*n.*
Teachers, 49, 53, 60, 96, 146, 279, 337*n.*, 368
  and administration, 71, 155, 171, 272, 273, 278, 347, 531, 538
  assignment of, to positions, 112, 113, 128, 305
  attitude of, toward authority, 242
    toward self-improvement, 227
  basis for employment of, 323
  contribution of, to coordination, 171
    to direction, 153–156, 159, 275
    to planning, 77, 155
  control of, 226–228, 231
  education of, 63, 71, 154, 176, 181, 188, 198, 226–228, 300, 311, 323, 372
  election of, 437–438
  incompetent, 372–373
  organization of, 58
  and research, 181
  responsibilities of, 89, 177–178, 209
  rights of, 73, 77, 87, 153–154, 178, 184, 186, 209, 272, 274–275, 277, 327*n.*, 388, 438–439, 558
  as specialists, 112, 175–176, 276
  tenure of, 53, 300, 311, 336, 338
  (*See also* Personnel; Professional ethics; Salary schedule; Teaching)
Teaching, 9, 35, 66, 106, 112, 113, 167, 172, 293
  ethics of (*see* Professional ethics)
  and guidance, 166
Teaching, personality in, 72
  in relation to other services, 193, 273, 346–348
  and research, 176
  rewards for, 371–372
  and supervision, 540
  and testing, 176
  theory of, 206
Tests, 176, 185, 213, 373, 459, 542, 543
Thompson, C. Bertrand, 5*n.*, 91*n.*, 129*n.*, 523*n.*
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 404*n.*, 534*n.*, 535
Toynbee, Arnold J., 534
Training for administration, 24, 71, 74, 113, 188
  (*See also* Study of school administration)

U

Urwick, L., 4*n.*, 6*n.*, 32*n.*, 40*n.*, 72*n.*, 88*n.*, 101*n.*, 126*n.*, 211*n.*, 286*n.*, 567*n.*, 590*n.*

V

Von Bergersrode, Fred, 498*n.*

W

Warren, Roland L., 215*n.*, 367*n.*
Watson, B. W. Walker, 7*n.*
Weeks, O. Douglas, 399*n.*
Wengert, Egbert S., 11*n.*, 14*n.*
Wilson, Francis G., 291*n.*
Wilson, Woodrow, 8*n.*, 312*n.*, 471*n.*, 507*n.*

MESTON TRAINING COLLEGE
12
371.2
MADRAS-14